R.H
L

GREEK RELIGION
to the TIME *of* HESIOD

By
A. LE MARCHANT

539030
21-4-52

MANCHESTER
SHERRATT AND HUGHES
1923

Printed in England at the Cloister Press, Heaton Mersey, Manchester

EDWARDO DEAKIN

propter ejus praeclara in religionem merita
hunc librum dedicat

A. LE M

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2014

https://archive.org/details/greekreligiontot00lema

PREFACE

RELIGION in all its aspects is the most important constituent of human nature. Penetrating all actions, it is the maker alike of heroes and peoples who make history; seated above all earthly thrones, its mandates transcend human authority, and exercise their power in the recesses of life where the most potent earthly sovereignty cannot enter; and the most lordly mind, the inflexible will, and the libertine affections are at times at least, and those the most critical, constrained to acknowledge its sway. To know men we must know their religion. Like king, like people. What is the nature and character of this Lord of the Soul? Their individual character, their history, their ideals, and their destiny are all implicit therein.

The development of religion even in the lowest tribes of mankind is luminous with instruction, for it shows the crude ore out of which the currency of religions is coined, and the primal emotions they express. What the Greek race made of its religious emotions and how it expressed them is more significant and possesses a more vital value than the same things in a tribe of Central Africa. The qualities that equipped Greek Christians for martyrdom and Greek Fathers for devotion were latent in the worshippers of Zeus, who caught glimpses of nymphs and dryads by streams and forest glades. We are "debtors to Jews and Greeks"; for the Shemites were not the only people upon whom the Creator bestowed a capacity for religious emotion, but our indebtedness to the Greeks has been but partially acknowledged. To Pheidias, Aeschylus, Plato, Herodotus, Father of History, and Demosthenes, Father of Eloquence, we recognize our obligations for the inspirations respectively of art, drama, philosophy, history, and eloquence; but in spite of the contributions of Greek Fathers and Greek cities to early Christianity the story of the development of religion in that people has been largely a matter for dictionaries of archæology and mythology. It is relegated to the world of the unreal. A single nation was regarded as the custodians and interpreters of the only religion worthy the name or inquiry, and the enigmatic utterances of Balaam were more

significant than how Teiresias prayed or Ulysses in the hour of his trial; and the momentary appearance of Zimri and Omri, less than grains of dust upon the threshing-floor, were better known than the victor of Ægospotamos, who changed the course of the world's history.

Prominent among the characteristics of Greek religion are its progress and its failures; and because they are common to all religions, as indeed to all human endeavours, they are instructive to all ages. England is as Athens, the North Sea as the Mediterranean; and though Pythagoras come not back again at the end of a cyclic age, holding the same wand and saying the same things to the same listeners, yet the same things recur from the same causes, and beneath the skin every man is a Platonist or an Aristotelian.

The history of religion in England is in part the history of lost opportunities. Religion always has her gaze fixed in the heavens, but men blind her eyes, despoil her of her plumage, and chain her to a wain. Her aspiration is for unity, yet the fiercest of wars are fought in her name; and when the opportunity for unity presents itself, then steal forth those who are ready in the name of religion to destroy it. Had the "Act for uniting their Majesties' Protestant Subjects," known as the Comprehension Bill, introduced in the House of Lords 1689, been passed, there would have been less need for our two centuries of prayers and penitential confessions over "our unhappy divisions." Religion desires the amelioration and extermination of the causes of human suffering; yet had its endeavours been to that end when steam machinery displaced the hand-worker and the modern industrial system was created, there would to-day be less bitterness of class antagonism.

This brief work is an endeavour to set forth some of the elements of early Greek religion, the aspirations that broke through them, and the failures that attended them.

I cannot close this preface without making acknowledgments of the utmost sincerity to those to whom much is owed: to Dr. Louis C. Purser, M.A., LL.D., Litt.D.,

Fellow of Trinity College, Dublin ; to Sir Samuel Dill, M.A., Litt.D., LL.D., Pro-Chancellor of Queen's University, Belfast ; to the late Dr. Owen C. Whitehouse, M.A., of Cambridge, who consecrated his scholarship to the benefit of others, of whom I was one; and to Mr. E. Deakin, late High Sheriff of Lancashire, whose friendship at all times is a possession to be esteemed, but especially when it conferred the privilege of being with him while he was enjoying the honours of that office.

A. LE MARCHANT

CONTENTS

CHAP.		PAGE
I.	Obscure Origins	1
II.	The Religion of the Ghostly	6
III.	The Dark Side of Religion Human Sacrifice	11
IV.	Seeking the Light The Attempt to Justify Human Sacrifice	25
V.	The Living and the Dead	33
VI.	The Third Estate of the Dead	42
VII.	Intercourse with the Unseen	51
VIII.	The Invasion of the Olympians	71
IX.	The Gifts of the Olympians	90
X.	The Poet as Theologian : I. Homer Gods and Men	101
XI.	Homer : Men and Gods	129
XII.	Homer : Men and Men	137
XIII.	Homer : Eschatology	152
XIV.	The Poet as Theologian : II. Hesiod	159
XV.	The Failure of the Theologian	178

GREEK RELIGION TO THE TIME OF HESIOD

Chapter I. Obscure Origins

RELIGION arose in Greece without either founder or law-giver. Like the Gothic architecture of the Middle Ages, it was the work of a corporate mind; it has left no name of the creative architect, and its evolutionary stages can be known only by its ruins. It gathered unto itself earlier elements: it mingled the native and the alien into an imposing unity. Not until it has accomplished an epoch-making transition is there associated with it any name of the constructive mind.

What preceded the cathedral of Rouen and of Rheims and of Tours? What preceded the Olympus of Homer? The one could not have been a primitive form any more than the other. Yet it was assumed that Zeus had reigned from his throne on snowy Olympus as long as men of Greek speech had tilled the fields at its foot, and that Poseidon had driven his chariots and steeds through the green seas as long as there had been dark-haired fishermen in rocky Ithaka. Yet Zeus had predecessors, but not those of poetic legend; Poseidon had fought for his realm, but not after the manner of poetic theology.

The starting-point for the investigation of the religion of ancient Greece is the notable statement of Herodotus:

ἔνθεν δὲ ἐγένετο ἕκαστος τῶν θεῶν, εἴ τε δ' αἰεὶ ἦσαν πάντες, ὁκοῖοί τέ τινες τὰ εἴδεα, οὐκ ἠπιστέατο μέχρι οὗ πρώην τε καὶ χθὲς, ὡς εἰπεῖν λόγῳ. Ἡσίοδον γὰρ καὶ Ὅμηρον ἡλικίην τετρακοσίοισι ἔτεσι δοκέω μευ πρεσβυτέρους γενέσθαι, καὶ οὐ πλέοσι. οὗτοι δέ εἰσι οἱ ποιήσαντες θεογονίην Ἕλλησι, καὶ τοῖσι θεοῖσι τὰς ἐπωνυμίας δόντες, καὶ τιμάς τε καὶ τέχνας διελόντες, καὶ εἴδεα αὐτῶν σημήναντες. ii. 53.

Dodona in the days of Herodotus preserved the tradition that there had once been a time when the gods were nameless.

ἐπωνυμίην δὲ οὐδ' οὔνομα ἐποιεῦντο οὐδενὶ αὐτῶν.
Hdt. ii. 52.

Such a condition is unthinkable, except where the gods are too numerous to be separately named and each too much dreaded to be omitted. The suppliant must have the name of a deity to invoke : he must know to whom he offers his sacrifices and performs his rites ; so must the recipient of them. No religion can centre around gods whose every altar has to be inscribed *ἀγνώστῳ θεῷ*. It is only the multitude of spirits, ghosts, vampires, and harpies that can be nameless.

Collectively a section of them can be called *Ἐυμενίδες*, because they are too many to be named singly and each too vindictive to be omitted. The interpretation used to be that *θεαί* was understood. They never attained the rank of deities, even in Æschylus. They were fierce, hideous, repellant. The sight of them upon the stage made spectators shudder ; the thought that they were haunting a man filled him with horror or drove him to madness.

Such as they were the nameless deities that filled the invisible world before Zeus sat supreme upon his throne. The change from nameless to named deities pre-supposes a religious revolution, and of that revolution Dodona preserved the recollection.

Nothing is more persistent than a custom. A new significance may be imparted to it ; fresh rites may be added ; but the original elements abide. The peasants of Greece to-day hold beliefs almost identical with those of the men who tilled the same fields in the days of Theokritos. The modern Simætha still tries to win back the vagrant love of her Delphis by the same means as her ancient namesake. She melts his image and pronounces her imprecation :

ἴϋγξ, ἕλκε τὺ τῆνον ἐμὸν ποτὶ δῶμα τὸν ἄνδρα.
Δέλφις ἔμ' ἀνίασεν · ἐγὼ δ' ἐπὶ Δέλφιδι δάφναν
αἴθω · χ' ὡς αὔτα λακεῖ μέγα καππυρίσασα,
κηξαπίνας ἄφθη, κοὐδὲ σποδὸν εἴδομες αὐτᾶς,
οὕτω τοι καὶ Δέλφις ἐνὶ φλογὶ σάρκ' ἀμαθύνοι . . .
ὡς τοῦτον τὸν καρὸν ἐγὼ σὺν δαίμονι τάκω,
ὡς τάκοιθ' ὑπ' ἔρωτος ὁ Μύνδιος αὐτίκα Δέλφις.

Theok. *Eid.* ii. 22-29.

She still uses a fringe of her false love's cloak to shred into the flames :

τοῦτ' ἀπὸ τᾶς χλαίνας τὸ κράσπεδον ὤλεσε Δέλφις,
ὠγὼ νῦν τίλλοισα κατ' ἀγρίῳ ἐν πυρὶ βάλλω.
Eid. ii. 53-54.

The spirit of evil is still adjured to depart into the mountains :

ἀλλὰ μάκαρ, θυμὸν βαρὺν ἔμβαλε κύμασι πόντου,
ἠδ' ὀρέων κορυφῇσι. *Orph. Hym.* xix.

A peasant will spit thrice to avert the evil eye, just as Damœtas did upon seeing his reflection in a pool :

ὡς μὴ βασκανθῶ δέ, τρὶς εἰς ἐμὸν ἔπτυσα κόλπον.
Theok. *Eid.* vi. 39.

To wake Pan at noonday still causes him to strike the offender with panic :

οὐ θέμις, ὦ ποιμάν, τὸ μεσαμβρινόν, οὐ θέμις ἄμμιν
συρίσδεν· τὸν Πᾶνα δεδοίκαμες· ἦ γὰρ ἀπ' ἄγρας
τανίκα κεκμακὼς ἀμπαύεται· ἐντὶ δὲ πικρός,
καὶ οἱ ἀεὶ δριμεῖα χολὰ ποτὶ ῥινὶ κάθηται.
Eid. i. 15-18.

He has left a curious trace of himself in the Septuagint translation of the Old Testament :

ἀπὸ συμπτώματος καὶ δαιμονίου μεσημβρινοῦ.
Ps. xc. [xci.] 6.

Charon still has his place in Hades, and Kerberos is with him. Honeycakes are placed in caves for the Fates, whom the lonely rustic declares he sometimes meets.

Some of the ancient elements have been Christianized. Demeter has become St. Demetra, and she is still the quickener of the fruits of the earth and the giver of abundant harvests. Instead of the obol, a piece of pottery is placed in the mouth of the dead, which may be inscribed I.X.NI.KA. in its four corners, or with the Pentagram of the Pythagoreans.

Practices persist : they are inherent in the national life, which never dies. Dr. Mahaffy recounts how one morning he saw a Greek woman step out of her cottage, and he was constrained to call to his companion : " Come, see

one of the figures of Pheidias from the frieze of the Parthenon." The ancient is always stepping into the living present.

Religious observances are deepest and most tenacious of all. The slow tides of civilization and the stormy billows of revolution pass over the world, but the religious life of the people, which lives, as it were, in the profound ocean caves, remains untouched by the upper tides and storms. The great Cloud-Compeller, the mighty Earth-Shaker, and austere Pallas Athene, Rouser of Peoples, become established on their heavenly seats, but there are recesses in the fields, silent ways in the mountains, and pools in the streams they cannot touch, nor the invisible agents of an ancient empire which was there ages before the Olympian came to the land.

At the present day Zeus and his assemblage of deities have long been expelled by One of higher attributes, whose existence is from eternity to eternity. Nevertheless, what is now regarded as superstition, but which was once the common religion, survives unvanquished. The most potent forces of organization and thought have hardly touched it. The villager of the countryside, who does not know the names of the men that made Athens immortal, practises rites that were common to the people before the bearers of those names were born.

It is not alone in the splendid temples of the Akropolis and in the marvels of the sculptor's chisel that the course of the people's religion is to be traced, but in the stealthy ceremonial practised in the cottage and in the stories told at night around the shepherd's fire. The lofty places of literature did not willingly suffer the approach of such things into their precincts, yet occasionally, to our great benefit, their existence was acknowledged. From such casual and reluctant references we are able to reconstruct much of an almost unknown world.

Inasmuch as the beliefs of Greece of to-day are traceable to the classic period, the presumption amounts almost to a complete certainty that those beliefs were nearest to the religious origins of the people. They belong to an age antecedent to an ordered theogony. They

resisted the incoming of high deities that can be specialized by names and can have temples for their worship; they succeeded through all the ages in appropriating unto themselves, in spite of hierarchies, sanctuaries, and oracles, a portion of the unfeigned homage of the populace. The lament of St. John Chrysostom over the inveteracy within the recognized church of customs which he calls pagan, but which were really ancient, was as appropriate in the days of Hesiod as in his own.

When religion has become conventionalized, and has been covered with the mantle of literature, the grosser elements pass into the twilight of life, like an ancestor of ill-repute, but the conscience of the people is aware they are there, and in secret, if not openly, pays its homage to them. In these days of universal education in England old dames still read each other's fortune in the grounds of their tea-cups, but no reference to the custom will be found in contemporaneous philosophy or poetry.

Chapter II. The Religion of the Ghostly

THE growth of religion in Greece followed much the same course as that which can be traced elsewhere. Ghosts came before the gods; little gods preceded the great ones. Perhaps by some good fortune, or ill, as the case might be, they could be seen; but, seen or not, they were always there, sometimes in units, sometimes in hosts without number.

The Greeks called them *κῆρες*. No place was free from them. There was a boggart, or a bogey, or a goblin, or a spook in every field, obsessing every house, invading every room, and seeking subtle opportunities to enter into the human body.

ἕκαστοι τῶν τόπων ἰδίας ἔχει κῆρας, οἱ μὲν ἐκ τοῦ ἐδάφους, οἱ δ' ἐκ τοῦ ἀέρος, οἱ δ' ἐξ ἀμφοῖν.

Theophrastus, *De Caus.* pl. 5. 10. 4.

It was worse than that: they were large enough to be terrible, but small enough also to hide anywhere and to alarm by their ubiquity. Amongst the many quotations preserved by Plutarch in his *Consolations to Apollonius* is the following:

ὅτι πλείη μὲν γαῖα κακῶν, πλείη δὲ θάλασσα, καὶ τοιάδε θνητοῖσι κακὰ κακῶν αμφί τε κῆρες εἰλεῦνται, κενεὴ δ' εἴσδυσις οὐδ' ἀθέρι.

Chap. xxvi.

Ἀθέρι is Professor G. Murray's emendation for *αἰθέρι*, which may be regarded as a certainty.

They could enter the body by the mouth, for they could subtly associate themselves with a man's food. The following quotation transmitted by Stobæus is probably of Orphic significance, but it bears traces of an earlier origin in popular belief:

κῆρας ἀπωσάμενος πολυπήμονας αἵ τε βεβήλων
ὄχλον ἀνιστῶσαι ἄταις περὶ πάντα πεδῶσι
παντοίαις μορφῶν χαλεπῶν ἀπατήματ' ἔχουσαι
τὰς μὲν ἀπὸ ψυχῆς εἴργειν φυλακαῖσι νόοιο.
οὗτος γάρ σε καθαρμὸς ὄντως δικαίως †ὁσιεύσει†,
εἴ κεν ἀληθείῃ μισέεις ὁλοὸν γένος αὐτῶν,
νηδὺν μὲν πρώτιστ' αἰσχρῶν δώτειραν ἁπάντων
ἣν ἐπιθυμία ἡνιοχεῖ μαργοῖσι χαλινοῖς.

Chap. v. 22.

If it were sacred food they counteracted its efficiency; if it were other food they gave serious trouble. Herein they were the predecessors of the modern microbe. One way to hinder their influence was to go fasting; another, according to Porphyry, was to eat vegetables with strong scents, which kept them away—a glimpse of the modern theory of disinfectants.

They caused nightmare, fever, blindness, madness, and all the evils that could afflict the body, including old age, which had its own particular κῆρ.

> πρὶν μὲν γὰρ ζώεσκον ἐπὶ χθονὶ φῦλ' ἀνθρώπων
> νόσφιν ἄτερ τε κακῶν καὶ ἄτερ χαλεποῖο πόνοιο
> νούσων τ' ἀργαλέων, αἵτ' ἀνδράσι κῆρας ἔδωκαν.
>
> *Hes.* O. D. 90-92.

When they had entered into the possession of the body they could be driven out by chewing Buckthorn, the Rhamnus Catharticus of the modern *Materia Medica*.

They could enter into a dead body as well as a living, and disturb the dead man's future life, whatever it might be; consequently means had to be taken to exclude them. A charm was placed in his mouth, across which the κῆρες could not pass. Later it was a coin, potent by virtue of the characters upon it. When the origin of the practice had vanished among the shadows of forgotten history the custom and the coin remained, and a new explanation was devised according with the newer phases of religious belief. The coin was for Charon, the Ferryman.

Much labour and time were devoted to defeating or evading these universal enemies of mankind. On some vases of a conventional type of the fifth century B.C. they are represented as a swarm of a kind of mosquito, some with a man's head and some with heads fashioned out of the imagination. Being fly-like, they could be caught like flies, and a daub of pitch upon the door would trap them. It had its parallel in the blood sprinkled over the lintel of the door by the Hebrews. It kept out the unseen destroyer, which could enter the unprotected door of the Egyptians without hindrance.

The festival of the Anthesteria was in one of its aspects a festival of cleansing the house from these unwelcome and unseen visitants.

> *θύραξε, κῆρες, οὐκ ἔτι Ἀνθεστήρια. ὡς κατὰ τὴν πόλιν τοῖς Ἀνθεστηρίοις τῶν ψυχῶν περιερχομένων.*
>
> Suidas, S. V. *θύραξε.*

It was a spring-cleaning with invocations and imprecations. The bogies were cleared out of the home, and they were warned that their right to sojourn in it was ended.

Magic and material means would not completely suffice: unseen deities and heroes of superior potency must be invoked. One such prayer is in the twelfth Orphic Hymn, addressed to Herakles. His efficacy for the work is recounted in the ascription:

> *Ἡρακλεῆς ὀβριμόθυμε, μεγασθενές, ἄλκιμε Τιτάν,*
> *καρτερόχειρ, ἀδάμαστε, βρύων ἄθλοισι κραταιοῖς,*

and much more of the same character. It is all the prelude to the service desired of him:

> *ἐλθὲ μάκαρ, νούσων θελκτήρια πάντα κομίζων.*
> *ἐξέλασον δὲ κακὰς ἄτας, κλάδον ἐν χερὶ πάλλων·*
> *πτηνοῖς τ' ἰοβόλοις κῆρας χαλεπὰς ἀπόπεμπε.*

The precious stone whose energy is such that it can ward off the hailstorms dreaded by the husbandman, for

> *ἐν δέ σοι ἀντίπαλον κεῖται μένος,*
>
> *Lithika*, 272.

is able to keep the *κῆρ*, equally hard to restrain, from the fields:

> *Λύχνι, σὺ δ' ἐκ πεδίου ῥόθιόν τ' ἀπόεργε χάλαζαν*
> *ἠμετέρου, καὶ κῆρας, ὅσαι στιχόωσιν ἐπ' ἀγρούς.*
>
> 268-9.

A man was liable to have his daily work marred by them. Probably his real *κῆρ* was his own carelessness, but the blame was transferred elsewhere. To counteract the evil influences of the unseen he placed ugly faces about his workshop and carved them upon his tools. For ugliness, even human ugliness, is unendurable to them, if only it be ugly enough.

In Homer they are in their transition stage between an abstract and a concrete existence. There is a *κῆρ* of death. *Od.* xi, 398.

τίς νύ σε κῆρ ἐδάμασσε τανηλεγέος θανάτοιο ;

That is an abstraction ; on the shield of Achilles it is an actual being :

ἐν δ' Ἔρις, ἐν δὲ Κυδοιμὸς ὁμίλεον, ἐν δ' ὀλοὴ Κὴρ,
ἄλλον ζωὸν ἔχουσα νεούτατον, ἄλλον ἄουτον,
ἄλλον τεθνηῶτα κατὰ μόθον ἕλκε ποδοῖιν.

Iliad xviii. 535-7.

They carry off the souls to Hades :

ἀλλ' ἤτοι τὸν κῆρες ἔβαν θανάτοιο φέρουσαι
εἰς Ἀΐδαο δόμους. *Od.* xiv. 207-8.

In that kind of occupation they are cousins to the Ἅρπυια, who is nothing but a monster *κῆρ*. In the famous description of Zeus weighing in his balances the fate of Hector they hold an intermediate and indeterminate position : they are both substantial and symbolical beings. They can be handled and placed in the scales ; they are also emblematic.

καὶ τότε δὴ χρύσεια πατὴρ ἐτίταινε τάλαντα,
ἐν δ' ἐτίθει δύο κῆρε τανηλεγέος θανάτοιο,
τὴν μὲν Ἀχιλλῆος, τὴν δ' Ἕκτορος ἱπποδάμοιο,
ἕλκε δὲ μέσσα λαβών · ῥέπε δ' Ἕκτορος αἴσιμον ἦμαρ,
ᾤχετο δ' εἰς Ἀΐδαο, λίπεν δέ ἑ Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων.

Iliad xxii. 209-13.

In Hesiod they have the same kind of ambiguity. They are microbic pixies that can be shut up in a jar and escape when the lid is removed,

ἀλλὰ γυνὴ χείρεσσι πίθου μέγα πῶμ' ἀφελοῦσα
ἐσκέδασ' · ἀνθρώποισι δ' ἐμήσατο κήδεα λυγρά,

O. D. 94-5.

and they are terrible monsters whose very representation on a battle-shield shall affright the enemy :

αἱ δὲ μετ' αὐτοὺς
Κῆρες κυάνεαι, λευκοὺς ἀραβεῦσαι ὀδόντας,
δεινωποὶ βλοσυροί τε δαφοινοί τ' ἄπλητοί τε
δῆριν ἔχον περὶ πιπτόντων. *Aspis H.* 248-51.

Thus they pass through their various mutations, becoming in the one direction Gorgon, Sphinx, Harpy, the Angel of Death, and finally the Κῆρες Ἐρινύες of Æschylus (*Septem Th.* 1055), the awesome and dread ministers of judgement that follow upon the heels of sin and exact vengeance upon the sinner. In the other direction they become creatures more grotesque than serious: things that can be dealt with more easily than a fowler snares birds with bird-lime, or else an image sitting upon a tomb.

ἐιμὶ δὲ κῆρ τυμβοῦχος.

Anthol. Pal. vii. 154.

One thing is clear: at the time of Homer and Herodotus they were firmly established in the popular belief, and therefore they must have had a history behind them long enough for the accomplishment of diverse mutations, which were as considerable as those that continued to the close of Hellenic religion, and then continued in Christianized form.

The significance of that fact is that religion in Greece had its origins where all religions began, so far as they can be traced, in a pantheism of hostile forces, which man has to defeat or placate. The savage of Terra del Fuego, of New Guinea, and of Central Africa has his Keres as numerous, as deadly, and as evasive as those the Athenian housewife sought to expel from her home at the annual festival, and he has his ways of dealing with them, which are not essentially different from hers. He has his Herakles, whom he calls his Medicine Man, his magic stones and charms, which he calls his "medicine," he eats special food to rid his body of them, devises traps for them, utters incantations against them, which a primitive Greek would have thoroughly understood.

Religiously the savage and the Greek began at the same point; but the Greek was no savage, so he did not stand still for countless centuries. He emancipated himself from the world that shrouded his soul in gloom and dread, and advanced into the sunshine, where he sought after a being great enough for his soul's communion.

Chapter III. The Dark Side of Religion: Human Sacrifice

THE man who first thought that the gods could be persuaded by gifts became the first priest to slay a sacrifice. He was the exponent of the primal instinct of man to win over to his side the unseen forces of life. He offered what he thought his god most needed. Hunger was his own tyrant. He who gave food gave life, strength, and leisure. The gods, too, suffered hunger. Jahveh, Lord of Hosts, feels it. "If I were hungry I would not tell thee," he is made to say in a psalm belonging to the period when more spiritual conceptions were dawning: "I will take no bullock out of thine house"; he will take no sacrifice at the hands of his worshippers, and the reason is: "Every beast of the forest is mine, and the cattle upon a thousand hills" (Ps. l, 9, 10, 12). The gods in Olympian banquets feast upon hecatombs; Dionysos and Hera of Sparta, as recorded by Pausanius (3. 15. 17), are both *αἰγοφάγος*, he is also *κριοφάγος*.

Food was strength: the first experience of the savage taught him that. The next step seemed simple and obvious; the strength was incorporate within the food when he ate it. The character of the creature was in its body; the strength of the ox, the courage of the lion, the fleetness of the deer, the cunning of the fox, and all in the man who ate them.

To eat a powerful enemy was to assimilate his prowess, and a battle was followed by a feast upon the slain as naturally as a hunt was followed by a feast upon the prey. To offer a human sacrifice unto gods and demons was as obligatory as the offering of any other, to be given as often as opportunity afforded.

Gods have sometimes to be appeased. They become angry because they have suffered neglect, they are offended because some of their rites have been inadequately performed. Offerings are presented to them for the placation of their wrath and the aversion of its consequences. A man is not to be turned from his anger by the offering of a trifle, still less a god. He can be moved only

by inducements the most precious : life in all its forms ; human life as the highest of all ; the life of those that are beloved, for that is the most precious of all ; a son or a daughter out of one's own house, for that is the dearest object in the world to a man.

Probably every sacrifice at first was a human sacrifice, either to satisfy the god's hunger or to placate his anger. Later he was induced to accept substitutes—a kid or an ox—as his banquet, or he would allow his indignation to subside before an offering, provided it had cost something. Abraham conceives that it is his obligation to sacrifice his only son unto the god he had chosen to follow, and then discovered that a ram would be acceptable as a substitute. The story is to explain the transition from one to the other.

In the earliest aspects of all religions, even of those that become most purified and spiritual, we find the altar of worship reeking with the blood of human victims. Long after Judaism had cast off its coarser garments, and prophets had proclaimed a purer and more joyous faith, the gloomy rites of early Hebraism obtrude themselves under the stress of national affliction or despair. The kings of Judah caused their sons " to pass through the fire " ; that is, to be slain and offered like any other whole burnt sacrifice, though one of them, Manassah, never ceased to acknowledge Jahveh as the supreme god of Israel. The awful ritual had its close and immemorial associations with the worship of the people. Ezekiel, who belongs to the sixth century before Christ, says :

" They have defiled my sanctuary . . . for when they had slain (*Sept.* σφάξειν) their children to their idols, then they came the same day into my sanctuary to profane it ; and lo, thus they have done in the midst of my house." (Ezek. xxiii, 38–39.)

Jeremiah, who belongs to the same period, denounces the practice, and more than once declares that it was not of Jahveh's instituting.

" They have built the high places of Tophet, which is in the valley of the son of Hinnom, to burn their sons and

their daughters in the fire, which I commanded them not, neither came it into my mind." (Jer. vii, 31. *See* also xix, 5.)

The sacrifice of the first-born is discussed by Micah, through the lips of Balaam, and rejected. (Chap. vi.)

It is manifest that such an offering by a man of what was most precious to him in all the world could be made only to the god he believed to be above all gods. The Moloch or the Baal to whom it was offered was no more the god of fire than he who upon Carmel answered by fire. It was no newly imported deity, but the recrudescence of primal rites under the influence of kindred Canaanitish cults. The anguish of the calamities of the seventh century constrained the people to imagine that their own reformed ritual was inadequate to achieve their salvation. The deity is to hear the language of the agony of surrender ; his altars are to flow with the blood of the children of his votaries. The Greek religion never attained the sublime and spiritual heights finally reached by the Hebrew. It lingered in the lower parts, and for a longer period carried the remnants of its ancient apparel. It felt ashamed of them, tried to conceal them, yet it was long before it finally parted with them.

Out of an age that was still a memory when the day of intellectual splendour dawned upon the race came stories of fathers sacrificing their daughters and mothers their sons, and the people preserved at least one rite of which a human sacrifice was part.

The story of the offering of Polyxene on the tomb of Achilles, as told by the herald Talthybios in the *Hekabe*, shows how clearly the tradition of human sacrifice lingered in the minds of the people. The graphic touches in the recital are more than the work of creative imagination. The spectators knew stories like it ; the fact was near enough to them to be vividly realized, hence the wealth of detail. The attitude of the Greek army towards the victim represented their own. The incident was comparable in its effects upon the mind of a Greek audience to that produced by the Three Witches meeting Macbeth upon an English audience two centuries ago. When they

first appeared upon the stage of the Globe Theatre it is thinkable that they sent a thrill through the spectators. Witches were a living reality to them; they believed that they had seen them, and they knew that many of them had been put to death. To-day neither the genius of Shakespeare nor the skill of the stage manager can give them substance and force. They are too remote to be real beings of flesh and blood. No modern Shakespeare could venture to make witches the active agents of his plot: they belong to a realm that has passed so far from our ken that the mind can neither enter it nor imagine its fictions as realities. Polyxene and Achilles, the altar and the sacrificial priest, were as real to an Athenian audience in the fourth century B.C. as witches to a London audience in the seventeenth century, and for the same reason.

The legend of the sacrifice of Iphigeneia to Artemis, as told in the two plays of Euripides, indicates even more clearly the same mental attitude. The people recognize that Artemis thirsts for human blood and rejoices to receive it.

> Ἄρτεμιν δέ νιν βροτοὶ
> τὸ λοιπὸν ὑμνήσουσι Ταυροπόλον θεάν.
> νόμον τε θὲς τόνδ'· ὅταν ἑορτάζῃ λεὼς,
> τῆς σῆς σφαγῆς ἄποιν', ἐπισχέτω ξίφος
> δέρῃ πρὸς ἀνδρὸς αἷμά τ' ἐξανιέτω
> ὁσίας ἕκατι θεᾶς, ὅπως τιμὰς ἔχῃ.
>
> *Iph. in T.* 1456-61.

The awful rites caused a shudder of horror: they can be spoken of only with bated breath.

> ναοῖσι δ' ἐν τοῖσδ' ἱερίαν τίθησί με,
> ὅθεν νόμοισι τοῖσιν ἥδεται θεὰ
> Ἄρτεμις ἑορτῆς, τοὔνομ' ἧς καλὸν μόνον,—
> τὰ δ' ἄλλα σιγῶ, τὴν θεὸν φοβουμένη·
> θύω γὰρ, ὄντος τοῦ νόμου καὶ πρὶν πόλει,
> ὃς ἂν κατέλθῃ τήνδε γῆν Ἕλλην ἀνήρ.
>
> *Iph. in T.* 34-39.

The editors endeavour to redeem the goddess to some extent from identification with the worst features of these barbaric rites. Kirchoff says that the latter passage is

corrupt; Paley says of the former that ὁσίας ἕκατι is "*religionis gratia*, to concede or recognize the demand of the goddess for human sacrifice, without actually perpetrating it." But it is clear that the Greek sailors, who have the misfortune to be wrecked at Tauri, are sacrificed, not because Thoas is a savage, barbaric monarch, but because the goddess is supposed to be pleased thereby.

The legend of a surrogate fawn for the daughter of the king is welcomed, not because of an unendurable repugnance to any kind of human sacrifice, but because the victim was one of noble birth.

ὡς μὴ μιάνῃ βωμὸν εὐγενεῖ φόνῳ. *Iph. in A.* 1595.

The historical significance of the words is not affected because they are in the epilogue added soon after the poet's death. The fact that the episode formed part of the drama put upon the stage is the significant thing.

It was not only upon the stage that the citizens of Athens in the days of its splendour were reminded of the conditions out of which they had but recently emerged, but by artists also, and sculptors, upon the walls of their homes, in their temples, upon the chalices out of which they drank and poured their banqueting libations to the gods, upon the craters in which they mixed their wine, and upon vases which decorated their rooms. People may accept a legend after it has become repugnant to their moral feeling as material for a drama, especially when the offending incident does not come nearer to the spectator than a narrative told by a messenger; but no convention would cause the people who witnessed the tragedy to ornament with abhorrent incidents the objects they desired to make beautiful, because they were constantly before their eyes or in their hands. They were things, as it were, but of yesterday only; they belonged to their forefathers as closely as other inheritances that had come down to them, like their laws, their customs, their sanctuaries, and their state. Their associations made them honourable, and they were not so remote from their own times as to belong to some other world than their own.

The introduction of the fawn into the story of the noble Iphigeneia marks a distinct stage in the development of the religious feeling of the Greek mind. It was endeavouring to think righteously of the gods unto whom it made its offerings, and whom it honoured in stately processions. The sacrifice took place, but the lovely Artemis could never have desired that her chaste altar should run with the blood of a king's daughter. Men in an age of ignorance might imagine such evil of her, but she will show by a display of her power that they wrong her majesty and profane her worship. The king was merely demonstrating that he esteemed her above all his worldly possessions. The desire of a man so devoutly expressed to win her favour will suffice ; a lesser sacrifice will be acceptable. It was not the blood of the noble, great-hearted woman that reddened the altar, but of a fawn placed by the goddess herself under the knife at the moment of its descent, and the same hand delivered the human victim to a life elsewhere of illustrious immortality.

The feelings of the messenger as he stood by the altar and watched Kalchas as he took the sacrificial knife, and marked with his eye the spot to strike, were the feelings of the throng that witnessed the play :

> *ἐμοὶ δέ τ' ἄλγος οὐ μικρὸν εἰσῄει φρενί.*
>
> *Iph. in A.* 1580.

When he beheld the unexpected wonder of the disappearance of the human victim, and in her place a panting fawn, he too, like the sailors worn with waiting, takes heart :

> *πρὸς ταῦτα πᾶς τις θάρσος αἶρε ναυβάτης.*
>
> *Iph. in A.* 1598.

It was a relief to the religious emotions to know that the maid who bared her neck to the knife of Kalchas never felt its edge : by the hand of the goddess she had honoured she was snatched from death into the company of the gods.

> *ἀπροσδόκητα δὲ βροτοῖς τὰ τῶν θεῶν,*
> *σώζουσί θ' οὓς φιλοῦσιν.* *Iph. in A.* 1610-11.

It is the parallel of the story of Jahveh and Abraham. Though the command to the patriarch to sacrifice his son

be divine, heaven will not endure its fulfilment. A messenger, as divine as the injunction, stays the father's hand. The willingness to obey and the ram opportunely entanged in the thicket shall suffice.

Men who have reached that stage are endeavouring to purify their gods into worthier form. They are trying to cleanse their skirts from the blood of men, and to redeem them from the accusation that they demand from the hands of man what no man ought to give.

οὐδένα γὰρ οἶμαι δαιμόνων εἶναι κακόν.

Iph. in T. 391.

It is a sign that the worshipper is seeking after a god at least equal to himself, and not more savage nor more cruel.

The Greek mind had a vision, as it had of most noble things, and sought to attain unto it. Many long years, many a struggle was needed, and even then the success was but partial. The time came when the blood of men no longer desecrates the altars of deity, but the savage associations were both too numerous and too strong for total extirpation. Wheat and tares were together, and no single hand could eradicate the one and yet spare the other. One hero genius attempted the task, and martyrdom was his reward. The purified deity was one unrecognizable to the populace ; such a being was not what they understood by god.

οὐκ ἐνόμιζεν οὓς ἡ πόλις νομίζει θεούς.

Those who followed him were compelled to find refuge either in atheism or naturalism. One thing could be safely said : There were no beings like those pictured by the people, or, if there were, they could not be gods. Yet that position finally failed also : a religion of atheism and a nation of atheists is equally impossible.

In the fierce and awful tragedy of the *Bacchæ* we have the story of a son who, invading the sacred rites of Dionysos his mother was attending, is caught by the votaries with the help of the god and torn limb from limb, while his mother, stricken with the divine madness, bears his head upon her wand, supposing it to be the head of a

boar caught in the forest. Slowly the god-distraught mind recovers its sanity, and the mother recognizes the head she bears as her trophy. It is a scene more full of awe and horror than any dramatist but Euripides could conceive or represent upon the stage. One of the losses in literature, which would be worth a koh-i-noor to recover, is the missing speech of the mother at that moment of recognition.

The poet represents the death of Pentheus as the penalty for his disbelief and for his profanation of the sacred ceremonies. It was really a sacrifice to Διόννσος ὠνηστής, wrought by the mother of the victim. Not only did the god eat the flesh of rams and of goats, but human flesh also. The dramatist makes the mother lose her reason before she does the deed, or the gruesomeness would be too horrible to bear. But it is her deed ; upon her staff is the head carried as an offering to the god, who is thus appeased and gratified. He has his banquet.

Dionysos came from barbarous Thrace, where he was a nature god. In Chios and Tenedos his altars flowed with the blood of men. By his might the Greeks are compelled to accept him. He comes with his leopard skin upon his shoulders, for the beast is still part of his being. Centaurs were his train of attendants, whose forms, sculptured on the metopes of the Parthenon, are the refined survivals of shaggy mountain men having the habits of beasts. In the *Iliad* they are φηρσὶν ὀρεσκῴοισι, (i, 268) and φῆρας λαχνήεντας, (ii, 743), with whom no human being could hold intercourse. In the *Odyssey* their transmutation is complete, and they have become centaurs (xxi, 303).

These native attendants upon the god could not be ignored nor endured. Poetry and pride alike joined in transforming them, but the essential elements of their nature could not be entirely eliminated.

Euripides knew the origin of the god and something of his nature, but it was more acceptable to ascribe to him an Asiatic origin than one too near at hand.

In the hymn sung to him with the burning of incense he is invoked as

ἄγριον, ἄῤῥητον, ἀρῄϊον, ὠμάδιον.

His ancient character could not be excluded even from his praises, though he can also be addressed

κλῦθι μάκαρ φωνῆς, ἠδὺς δ' ἐπίπνευσον ἐνηής,
εὐμενὲς ἦτορ ἔχων, σὺν ἐϋζώνοισι τιθήναις.

The old and the new attributes are combined, however contradictory they may be. This is the method of all religions, Christian and pagan, but especially of the Greek, whether Christian or pagan.

Several instances of human sacrifice are recorded by Pausanias, among which is the story of Aristodemos of Messenia (iv, 9, 1–5). The king and his people, vanquished in their struggle against Sparta, decided to abandon their town in the open country and establish themselves in Ithome; κλωμακόεσσαν Homer calls it. (*Il.* ii, 729.) There they strengthen the natural defences of the selected height by building a rampart around it large enough to contain them all. They send to consult the Delphian oracle, which instructs them to sacrifice by night to the lower powers a maiden of their own or alien race. The king devotes his daughter to the immolation, and, like Agamemnon, in a few years he suffered for his deed.

Pausanias does not mention the reason for the sacrifice, but the story makes it clear. The maiden was sacrificed to the νέρτεροι δαίμονες who possessed the place, so that the new city with its fortifications might abide secure under their propitiated guardianship. The association of the sacrifice with the Delphian oracle is an indication that it was not the outcome of merely local feeling, but was a rite recognized generally by the people.

Probably some such sacrifice was offered at the laying of all foundations, and every building was strengthened by the shedding of blood. The custom was known when the Achæans built their great wall and beetling towers, a bulwark of their ships against the soldiers of Ilium. (*Il.* vii, 442–463.) The offended Poseidon destroys it (xii, 3–33), and twice the reason is given,

οὐδὲ θεοῖσι δόσαν κλειτὰς ἑκατόμβας.

In Homer the grosser elements of religious ritual are refined, but it is highly probable that some human sacri-

fices would have their place among the hecatombs demanded by the Earth-Shaker, Lord of the Trident, who was one of the gods of the Under World, as the black bulls upon his altars show. (*Od.* iii, 6.)

Curious indications of the human element in these sacrifices have been perpetuated in the religious practices of modern Greece. One of the commonest folk-songs tells how some builders of a bridge had their day's work undone every night by the demon of the place, who was appeased by having sacrificed to him the wife of the master builder. The story takes diverse forms, and is told of many a bridge as well, but there is always a human sacrifice before the work can be successfully completed.

At the present day in Greece it is still customary to propitiate the demon of the place, and to induce him to become the guardian of the new structure, by offering a sacrifice to him. According to the importance of the undertaking it will be an ox or a goat or a cock, all preferably black in colour. The rites that Poseidon demanded at the building of the Achæan wall of bronze have maintained their place in more than shadowy form up to the present day. The belief that there is greater efficacy in a human sacrifice still keeps its firm hold upon the minds of the people. Happily a symbolic offering suffices. A hair, a rag of a garment, an old shoe, a stick, or a piece of twine marked with the stature of the dedicated person will answer the purpose, and is buried under the foundation-stone.

These offerings are not a mere simulation ; they have a veritable potency. They are the first instalments of an obligation : the succeeding ones will be exacted before the year is out. From an enemy, therefore, the builder will endeavour to obtain the tokens. Alternatively, someone near his dissolution may be induced to provide them.

A human shadow can be laid beneath the stone, and grim stories are told of civic officers, whose duty it is to attend stone-laying ceremonies, falling victims in rapid succession to the deadly perils of their office.

The recollection of the black bull or black ram as offerings to the gods of the Under World still survives,

and with it the knowledge that once in those far-off ages, which the mind of the people cannot forget, there were sacrifices also of more fearful awe and of mightier potency.

It is uncertain at what age the new and purer vision of both god and altar came to Greece, or what soul first saw it. It was a great creative moment,

ἐπεί γε ἀπεκρίθη ἐκ παλαιτέρου τοῦ βαρβάρου ἔθνεος τὸ Ἑλληνικόν. *Hdt.* i. 60.

Like the birth of all spiritual things, it cometh " not with observation " ; no one recorded it. Approximately the date must have been when the Olympians completed their conquest of the native deities. It was a conflict between Zeus, the Lord of the Sky, whose throne was on the high mountains, and the gods of the dark Under World, shrouded in gloom, stained with blood, worshipped in horror and fear. The emblem of the one was the eagle, of the other the serpent ; and the eagle bruised the serpent's head.

The struggle is always long, but happily for mankind the issues are always the same. Some generations must have been necessary to purge away the baser elements alone. Tradition ever offers a stubborn resistance to its complete subjugation, even before the force of the Hellenic intellect. Moral darkness is never vanquished as easily as the night is vanquished by the dawn. The eagle and the serpent were united by the worshipper in a kind of partnership of godhead. The diverse elements coalesced in a union of the new title and the old. Around every shrine and sacred place the battle raged, silent yet ceaseless. The antagonistic elements could not continue to exist on an equality. The better were the stronger—as, happily for mankind, they always are in the end in this world—and the baser receded into obscurity to live by stealth, or permitted to reappear in some more presentable form at an annual festival or rustic celebration.

The slowness of the struggle can be seen clearly in the survival of human sacrifices to Zeus himself on Mount Lykaion, probably up to the time of Pausanias. That was

an exception, but it indicates the resisting power of the ancient Under World. The victory of the eagle was never entirely complete : the serpent bruised its heel.

The period of the eighth to the sixth centuries was for Greece what the century of the Renaissance was to modern Italy. At the beginning of that period it is scarcely distinguishable from the surrounding barbarians ; at the close it is arrayed in its garments of splendour, and walks the earth an unchallenged queen among the nations. Life was larger, therefore more precious ; it was richer, therefore more strongly protected. The killing of captives at the tomb of a hero had become an enormity. Criticism was directing its shafts against the ancient régime, both moral and religious, at the time of Xenophanes, who was born about the third or fourth decade of the sixth century.

ἀπὸ Ξενοφάνους τε καὶ ἔτι πρόσθεν ἀρξάμενον.

Soph. 242, D.

says the Stranger in Plato's dialogue. Peisistratos, born about 605 B.C., though tyrant over the state, appeared voluntarily before a court at Athens when charged with murder. Great, indeed, were the changes that had come to pass.

Beyond that period the mist of the ages is too thick for distinct vision : all forms are alike, equally solid or equally unsubstantial. A hundred and fifty of those swiftly moving years would probably provide sufficient time for the purifying conception that the gods rejoiced not in the blood of men to become crystallized in general practice. That would make the date of its inception in definite form about the year 750 B.C., which would bring it near the time when Homer came to Greece.

The moment was a great one to the people that could receive it, like unto the one that came to the Hebrew race, as tradition affirmed, through its patriarch Abraham. The Jew followed the gleam, in the main, with steady vision and resolute step. He lost it intermittently amidst the cross lights and shadows of the surrounding world, but not permanently. He could distinguish between an

ignis fatuus and a star. Relatively early in his history he could think of God as being the supremely holy One, unto whose robes no assailment of evil could come.

"And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying: Speak unto all the congregation of the children of Israel, and say unto them, Ye shall be holy: for I the Lord your God am holy." (Lev. xix, 1–2.)

Slowly the august vision emerged: hard was the struggle to achieve it, and to win for the world a Deity, spiritual and pure, from whom, finally, the contaminations of Egypt and of Babylon and of Persia fell away. It was a Jew of a later age who said to his fellow patriots scattered about the world:

"As he which hath called you is holy, so be ye holy in all manner of conversation." (Peter i, 15.)

He had won the goal the Greek sometimes looked at but failed to reach.

The horror of eating human entrails at the banquet of Zeus Lykaios does not seem to horrify Plato as the wickedness of Ahaz in making his son "to pass through the fire" horrifies the unknown chronicler of the Jews. The sacrifice of Agamemnon's daughter is viewed with pity by the Greek; the sacrifice of Jephthah's daughter with horror by the Jew. It was a time for the rending of garments, and the memory of it a time for lamentation.

"When he saw her he rent his clothes. . . . It was a custom in Israel that the daughters of Israel went yearly to lament the daughter of Jephthah the Gileadite four days in a year." (Judges xi, 35, 40.)

Zeus was too human to become spiritualized; too powerful to be dethroned, except by a being who was as high above him as his dwelling in the blue sky was above the demonic habitations in the dark places of the earth. The Greek had not the spiritual gifts of the Shemite, whose very adversities made him turn to a God of justice and whose sins made him seek a God of mercy. Prosperity smiled upon the children of Hellas, who never realized the need of a God of comfort until it was too late. Their refuge was the denial of all gods, yet they were never able to make it successfully. The gods were there, and there

they must abide till their failure to raise the people to a moral and spiritual altitude is manifest to the world, and then they will vanish away. An eclectic revival may be attempted, ritual splendour may accompany the sunny anthropomorphism, philosophy may adorn it with rhetoric, but the word is heard throughout the nations:

Πὰν ὁ μέγας τέθνηκε.

Plut. *De Orac. Def.*

The Greek mind could make its splendid beginning, but could not persevere to the end.

Chapter IV. Seeking the Light: The Attempt to justify Human Sacrifices

ATHENS at the time of its greatness was a city of remarkable contradictions. Incompatibilities in every other age and nation were there linked in close companionship. The beauty of its intellectual life and tolerance of human sacrifice are far asunder, yet they continued side by side. Other nations maintained the custom, but no other nation was endowed with the Greek genius. In no state was the interval between the gold of the intellect and the clay of practice so pronounced. It does not follow that every citizen had witnessed the binding of one of his fellow men upon the altar. Few people in England have seen the felling of an ox, yet it is frequent enough. The thing was there in Athens, but it was *ἐν ἀπορρήτῳ*. The whole of a nation's life is not to be put into its songs, nor sent to parade in its histories.

Potent indeed must have been the cause that led to the continuance of the practice. It must have been sublime enough to justify its barbarity before the throne of reason: to make the horrible lawful and the repulsive necessary. What that justification was has now to be considered.

During the festival of the Thargelia at Athens there was a ceremony in which two men called Pharmakoi, decked with branches, were led out of the city. The evidence concerning the ceremony is late and conflicting. The two men selected were scoundrels, so that their name on the stage and in the law courts, and presumably wherever men abused each other, was equivalent to blackguard.

> *τοῖς δὲ χαλκοῖς καὶ ξένοις καὶ πυρρίαις*
> *καὶ πονηροῖς κἀκ πονηρῶν εἰς ἅπαντα χρώμεθα*
> *ὑστάτοις ἀφιγμένοισιν, οἷσιν ἡ πόλις πρὸ τοῦ*
> *οὐδὲ φαρμακοῖσιν εἰκῇ ῥᾳδίως ἐχρήσατ' ἄν.*
>
> Aristoph. *Ran.* 730-33.

νῦν οὖν χρὴ νομίζειν τιμωρουμένους καὶ ἀπαλλαττομένους Ἀνδοκίδου τὴν πόλιν καθαίρειν καὶ ἀποδιοπομπεῖσθαι καὶ φαρμακὸν ἀποπέμπειν καὶ ἀλιτηρίου ἀπαλλάττεσθαι, ὡς ἓν τούτων οὗτός ἐστιν. Lys. *Contra Andok.* 108. 4.

They passed through a period of consecration, during which they were maintained at the public expense and on sacred food, such as cheese, barley-cake, and dried figs. On the day they were led out of the city they were beaten upon their privy parts with branches of wild figs and squills.

So far the authorities agree: what happened to the men after that? Harpokration says that the rest of the ceremony was only a piece of mimetic magic:

Δύο ἄνδρας Ἀθήνησιν ἐξῆγον, καθάρσια ἐσομένους τῆς πόλεως ἐν τοῖς Θαργηλίοις, ἕνα μὲν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀνδρῶν, ἕνα δὲ ὑπὲρ τῶν γυναικῶν . . . καὶ τὰ τοῖς Θαργηλίοις ἀγόμενα τούτων ἀπομιμήματά ἐστιν. S. V. *φαρμακός.*

That is, the proceedings were mimetic of the death of a man who was supposed to have borne the name Pharmakos, who was stoned to death for stealing cups from Apollo.

That is the only piece of evidence that gives that interpretation of them, and it is manifestly unsatisfactory. It is an inventive guess as fictional as the name of the man and the cups of the god. It fails in the thing it set out to explain: the physical ritual is not the prelude to the imitation of the stoning of two men.

Although the evidence and the interpretation are both far from satisfactory, they are accepted by Professor G. Murray and Miss Harrison. He does not like to think an ill thought of Athens, so he welcomes the assertion that the ceremony was not a real sacrifice; she does not like to differ from Professor Murray.

The testimony that the two Pharmakoi were actually sacrificed is both direct and consistent. Tzetzes, in commenting upon the passage in Hipponax, says that if any disaster befell the city from the gods,

τῶν πάντων ἀμορφότερον ἦγον ὡς πρὸς θυσίαν·
εἰς καθαρμὸν καὶ φάρμακον πόλεως τῆς νοσούσης.
εἰς τόπον δὲ τὸν πρόσφορον στήσαντες τὴν θυσίαν,
τυρόν τε δόντες τῇ χειρὶ καὶ μάζαν καὶ ἰσχάδας,
ἑπτάκις γὰρ ῥαπίσαντες ἐκεῖνον εἰς τὸ πέος
σκίλλαις, συκαῖς ἀγρίαις τε καὶ ἄλλοις τῶν ἀγρίων,
τέλος πυρὶ κατέκαιον ἐν ξύλοις τοῖς ἀγρίοις,
καὶ τὸν σποδὸν εἰς θάλασσαν ἔρραινον καὶ ἀνέμους,
καὶ καθαρμὸν τῆς πόλεως, ὡς ἔφην, τῆς νοσούσης.

That is a reasonably clear statement: the man was sacrificed and his ashes were scattered. That was a more effective means of preventing a dead man from disturbing his murderers than cutting off his hands and feet. Professor Murray maintains that in the above passage there is no object to *κατέκαιον*, and it might be *τὴν θυσίαν*, which is the effigy of the man. After all, he says, it was only *ὡς πρὸς θυσίαν*. Besides, Tzetzes did not understand what he read; he seldom did, and he was an inaccurate writer. So urges the Professor. Perhaps, after all, the commentator did understand his book. What was led out was *τῶν πάντων ἀμορφότερον*, which could hardly be said of an effigy, or of anything but a human being. A scholium on Equit. 1135 says:

ἔτρεφον γάρ τινας Ἀθηναῖοι λίαν ἀγεννεῖς καὶ ἀχρήστους καὶ ἐν καιρῷ συμφορᾶς τινος ἐπελθούσης τῇ πόλει, λοιμοῦ λέγω ἢ τοιούτου τινος, ἔθυον τούτους ἕνεκα τοῦ καταρθῆναι τοῦ μιάσματος.

That is plain, and gives the explanation, if any were needed, of what was burned. The scholiast writes *λοιμοῦ λέγω*, and that vitiates the testimony in the eyes of Professor Murray: it shows that it came from a bad period; besides, it is wrong.

Another scholium on the word *δημοσίους* is worth citing:

λείπει βοῦς ἢ ταύρους ἢ ἄλλο τι τοιοῦτον θῦμα. δημοσίους δὲ τοὺς λεγομένους φαρμακοὺς, οἵπερ καθαίρουσι τὰς πόλεις τῷ ἑαυτῶν φόνῳ· ἢ τοὺς δημοσίᾳ καὶ ὑπὸ τῆς πόλεως τρεφομένους.

The first explanation has no confirmation from any other source, but it seems to be a reminiscence of the fact that it was a real sacrifice that was offered. The second explanation is more precise, and preserves the tradition that it was men who were offered and that they were offered for the well-being of the state.

The scholiast on Ranæ 733 has shed another small beam of light upon the perplexity. He says:

τοὺς γὰρ φαύλους καὶ παρὰ τῆς φύσεως ἐπιβουλευομένους εἰς ἀπαλλαγὴν αὐχμοῦ ἢ λοιμοῦ ἤ τινος τῶν τοιούτων ἔθυον, οὓς ἐκάλουν καθάρματα.

Whatever the testimony of these grammarians may be worth, they are almost unanimous in saying that a man was really sacrificed, or men. The definiteness of the last extract is its condemnation in the judgement of Professor Murray. It says ἔθυον, he writes, exactly what one would expect from inferior scholia which abbreviate their sources. The writer said that " for short, because he was careless."

There is the record of an actual Pharmakos sacrifice at Marseilles, preserved by Servius ad Verg. (*Æn.* iii, 75.) He says the Gauls had a custom, which was followed at Marseilles, that if a pestilence befell the city one of the poor people offered himself to the city. He was kept at the public charge and fed upon pure diet. Afterwards he was arrayed in holy garments, adorned with flowers, and led through the city, and the populace all cursed him as he went, so that the evil of the city might fall upon him. Then he was cast down headlong.

The evidence is of no direct value as to what happened in Athens some centuries earlier, but it shows the existence of a custom almost identical with the one said to be current there, and with the same religious significance.

It may not be possible to decide the question with complete certainty, but the conclusion that the two Pharmakoi, after being led out of the city, were put to death is as reliable as any of the answers we can give to our archæological problems.

Whatever may have been the practice in later years, there must have been a time when it was no mimetic or magical ceremonial but a veritable human sacrifice. Whether changed or unchanged in its ritual, it is a survival from that unknown period we have been trying to explore, and it maintained itself in the habits of the people long after its original significance and environment had passed away.

The word φαρμακός, when it has its ceremonial significance, is generally translated " scapegoat," yet there is but little or no resemblance to the Levitical scapegoat which determines for us the connotation of the word. Aaron was to put all the sins of the children of Israel upon

the head of a goat by confessing them over it, and then it was to be sent alone into the wilderness. (Lev. xvi, 20–22.) In the case of the Pharmakos there is nothing corresponding with the essential part of the Hebrew ritual of transferring the sins of the people to a sin-bearer. At Marseilles the man was cursed by the people, but no reference indicates that anything of that kind was done at Athens. Indeed, the ceremonial striking with squills and branches of the wild fig signifies the opposite. It was a symbolical purification; the purgative effects of the plants were transmitted to the one that was struck. He carried no man's sins, not even his own. Physically and sexually he had been made pure; he was nearer a high-priest than a scapegoat, notwithstanding his antecedents.

Why should such a one be expelled from the city and then put to death? Or why should his death be preceded by those ceremonial purifications? The answer that has to be given is interesting: he was being sent through the gates of death to the gods, and he who goes on that embassage must be purified for it. Menippus, according to Lucian, has to submit to purification before he can consult the oracle:

ἐκάθηρέ τε με, καὶ ἀπέμαξε, καὶ περιήγνισε δᾳδίοις καὶ σκίλλῃ.
Nek. 7.

The Pharmakos is a messenger from the people to the gods; the incarnation of their supplications to the deity who can remove their calamity. Prayers are at best uncertain. May not a god be sleeping, or on a journey, or indifferent, just as other people are? A messenger might stand a better chance; grave disasters demand heroic remedies.

The Greeks knew of such a custom. Herodotus describes a Thracian tribe who despatched a victim by death to their god, who was called Zalmoxis.

. . . ἀποπέμπουσι ἄγγελον παρὰ τὸν Ζάλμοξιν, ἐντελλόμενοι τῶν ἂν ἑκάστοτε δέωνται. πέμπουσι δὲ ὧδε· οἱ μὲν αὐτῶν ταχθέντες, ἀκόντια τρία ἔχουσι· ἄλλοι δὲ διαλαβόντες τοῦ ἀποπεμπομένου παρὰ τὸν Ζάλμοξιν τὰς χεῖρας καὶ τοὺς πόδας, ἀνακινήσαντες αὐτὸν, μετέωρον ῥιπτεῦσι ἐς τὰς λόγχας· ἢν

μὲν δὴ ἀποθάνῃ ἀναπαρεὶς, τοῖσι δὲ ἵλεως ὁ θεὸς δοκέει εἶναι· ἢν δὲ μὴ ἀποθάνῃ, αἰτιῶνται αὐτὸν τὸν ἄγγελον, φάμενοί μιν ἄνδρα κακὸν εἶναι. iv. 94.

The description does not read like one given to readers who were totally unfamiliar with the idea. Implicit comparisons between foreign and Greek customs are frequent enough in Herodotus; they are one of his literary artifices. He indicates aspects that are like or unlike something already within the reader's knowledge. The next paragraph to the above provides an illustration by the association of Pythagoras and Zalmoxis, each in his own nation the exponent of the doctrine of immortality. What does he want to indicate here? Apparently that the same idea is common to the Greeks and the Getæ, but that it is diversely executed—by impaling amongst the latter, which was repugnant to the Greek, and in the person of one of their own people, not in a prisoner or slave. As for the rest, it was a Greek custom in the land of Thrace.

The conception that the dead could carry messages into the realms of the dead was common enough. Polyxena, just before she is offered upon the tomb of Achilles, is made to say:

τί σοι πρὸς Ἕκτορ' ἢ γέροντ' εἶπω πόσιν;

To which Hekube makes answer:

ἄγγελλε πασῶν ἀθλιωτάτην ἐμέ. *Hek.* 422-3.

The idea survives in modern Greek life. Messages are whispered into the ear of one on the point of death, or who has just died, and it is said that "he is collecting letters for the dead."

The belief that the Pharmakos was the ambassador of sorrow-stricken and afflicted men to Apollo, who was associated with the Thargelia, or to any other of the gods, would explain why the sacrifice survived into a late age. It had a tremendous motive behind it, which gave it an impressive sanction possibly long after the belief had waned into the mists of the past, and a traditional custom alone showed what was once dear to men.

The Greek writers are reticent about the prevalence of human sacrifice: it is too horrible for them. For long

centuries the sacrifice on Mount Lykaion was enacted, but there is only one single veiled allusion to it, which would be unintelligible except for a late reference of Pausanias, who classes it amongst the things unnameable. Lover of details as he is, he cannot constrain himself to give a description of what he knows. He leaves his readers to supply his omissions from their own knowledge.

The writers who draw a veil over the sacrifice of the Pharmakos are actuated by the same motive, strengthened by patriotism. If it were mimetic there would be no need for mere allusiveness ; the fact could be stated plainly. The silence indicates that there is something to be silent about.

For a man to be a messenger on behalf of his fellow mortals to the immortal gods might well be regarded as an honour, and a service to which a man might nobly dedicate himself for his nation's welfare. When it was practised not under the stress of some great calamity, but as part of an annual festival, it was degraded into murder in which the citizens were accessories.

The original conception of the sacrifice was probably the common one that it satisfied the appetite of the god to whom it was offered. Then came the elimination of the beast-like form from the god, a process to which all of them were subjected by the humanizing Greek mind, and the original purpose of the sacrifice was forgotten ; but the custom did not die with the change of theology, and a justification was needed suitable to a more enlightened age. It was found in the belief that the dead could be messengers to the rulers as well as to the inhabitants of the unseen world, if they were rightly prepared for the office and given an auspicious start upon their way.

The theological change probably belongs to the period prior to Homer, when a similar evolution was taking place generally with the gods of Hellas and they were all being transformed. The snake form of Meilichios, the dread god to be placated, passed away and Zeus had his throne in its place, first with the snake, and then without it. Where the snake still holds its place he is mostly spiritualized into the type of a new birth, because he

sloughs his old skin and enters into newness of life. The ritual of fertility ceremonials with their objectionable emblems is purified, and a mother with her daughter, both fair to look upon, become the central deities. The other things, still there with their offensive associations, were explained away. The realities were Demeter and Kore. The animal god, the bird god became unthinkable; the animal and the bird went the way of the snake, and radiant deities were in their place.

Great, indeed, was the achievement that raised such creations upon the old, noisome soil of barbaric religion, transfigured the loathsome into things of beauty that, when expressed in stone, should live as the admiration of all time. It was one of the notable accomplishments of the human soul: the greatness of the Greek is manifest in his work. So also are his imperfections. His creations finally perished, with the assent of their own worshippers, through the corroding elements left in them. He failed to create in his noble gods the nobility of a righteous character.

Chapter V. The Living and the Dead

THE dead still live: so held the Greek race, even when the Jew was declaring that there was but silence and darkness and oblivion beyond the grave. The Greek received the vision earlier, but he never made so much of it as the Jew, who gave it, in accordance with his religious character, a strongly moral significance. The continuance of life was a vivid reality to the Greek, which he had brought with him out of the indiscernible past, but it had no moral bearing upon his life here. The state of the dead depended upon the acts of those who survived them. They became wandering ghosts about the haunts of men, disturbing their survivors, or abiding inhabitants of the after world, according to whether funeral obsequies had been given them or not.

When we are able to get the first definite glimpses of the funeral customs of Greece we see the two rites of inhumation and cremation being practised side by side, or else are so merged together as to become parts of the same ceremony.

The earliest literary evidence is in the Homeric poems, which will be considered, not with a view to discovering the eschatology of the poet, but rather to trace back to their origins the customs he records and to find their significance.

First of all, there are two methods of disposing of the dead recorded in both the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. The body may first be cremated and afterwards buried; then the latter act is as much part of the rites as the former: or there might be burial alone; then there was no feeling of maimed rites.

Achilles slew Eetion, and, magnanimous hero that he was, gave his enemy the full ceremonial of cremation and burial, with a monument to mark the place where his ashes were buried. The body of Patroklos is burned in the centre of the pyre, and the victims, both beast and man, are burned in a circle around it. After the flames have been quenched with red wine, the bones of the hero are collected into a golden urn, and then placed in a tomb of appropriate magnificence, ἀλλ' ἐπιεικέα τοῖον. The same procedure is followed in the case of the dead Hektor:

his whitened bones are gathered with tears, placed in a golden urn and covered with a purple pall, and then buried under a lofty stone monument.

The ghost of Elpenor comes to meet Odysseus at the threshold of the Under World, and supplicates him by loved wife and son and all that is dear to him, to give burial to his body lying neglected in the island of Kirke; but he does not ask for the burning of the pyre: burial alone suffices. When Odysseus and his companions return to the home of Kirke they bestow full honours upon it. They burn the body clad in its armour, and then inter the ashes. The way in which the word *θάπτομεν* is used in the narrative seems to indicate that it had already acquired a meaning so generalized as to describe either rite, or both. Later that usage of the word becomes more pronounced, so that it is possible to say *πυρὶ θάπτειν*. (Jac. Anth. F.P. 445), and Isæus can describe the procession from the house, irrespective of the nature of the ultimate rites, as *θάπτειν ἐξ οἰκίας* (Is. 71, 13). It had become immaterial whether the corpse received cremation or inhumation. Either rite was optional, and either could be employed without detriment to the dead or the living.

In Homer there is a distinct preference for the crematorial ritual. It was at least a greater honour. A man might not request it for himself; that would be immodest; but his companions gave it to him, being worthy, as a matter of course. The greater honour points back to the time when amongst the Achæans it was the greater service.

At the time of Herodotus the preference for one form over the other is merely because ceremonials incidental to burning the body give opportunity to the wealthy to make a sumptuous display. Of the Thracians he says:

ταφαὶ δὲ τοῖσι εὐδαίμοσι αὐτῶν εἰσὶ αἵδε. τρεῖς μὲν ἡμέρας προτιθέασι τὸν νεκρόν· καὶ παντοῖα σφάξαντες ἱρήϊα, εὐωχέονται, προκλαύσαντες πρῶτον· ἔπειτα δὲ θάπτουσι κατακαύσαντες, ἢ ἄλλως γῇ κρύψαντες. χῶμα δὲ χέαντες, ἀγῶνα τιθεῖσι παντοῖον, ἐν τῷ τὰ μέγιστα ἆεθλα τίθεται κατὰ λόγον μουνομαχίης.

Hdt. v. 8.

The way in which the historian uses the word ἄλλως shows clearly enough his own predilection.

Besides the dual mortuary rites in Homer there is also a duality of personality amongst the living. The differentiation of soul from body is clear, but it is by no means clear whether the σῶμα or the ψυχή be the seat of personality. The ψυχή can leave the body for a season :

> τὸν δ' ἔλιπε ψυχὴ, κατὰ δ' ὀφθαλμῶν κέχυτ' ἀχλύς·
> αὖτις δ' ἀμπνύνθη, περὶ δὲ πνοιὴ Βορέαο
> ζώγρει ἐπιπνείουσα κακῶς κεκαφηότα θυμόν.
>
> *Il.* v. 696-8.

Yet the man himself is not dead ; he is there on the ground with the blood flowing from his wound. It is but a subordinate portion of himself that has temporally left him. The ψυχή can be sent into Hades, but the men themselves receive a very different fate.

> πολλὰς δ' ἰφθίμους ψυχὰς Ἄϊδι προΐαψεν
> ἡρώων, αὐτοὺς δὲ ἑλώρια τεῦχε κύνεσσιν
> οἰωνοῖσί τε πᾶσι. *Il.* i. 3-5.

The ψυχαί of the men are not the men themselves, αὐτοί. The ψυχή of Patroklos, clad as it was in life, is after all merely a counterfeit of the man's self.

> ἦλθε δ' ἐπὶ ψυχὴ Πατροκλῆος δειλοῖο,
> πάντ' αὐτῷ, μέγεθός τε καὶ ὄμματα κάλ', ἐϊκυῖα,
> καὶ φωνὴν, καὶ τοῖα περὶ χροῒ εἵματα ἕστο.
>
> *Il.* xxiii. 65-67.

The ψυχή of the dead man has the powers of speech and vision and movement and thought, but the personality is identified with the dead body now lacking all these things. So the dead man himself affirms :

> ἐπήν με πυρὸς λελάχητε. *Il.* xxiii. 76.

From such passages as these, which might be further multiplied, it is clear that both ψυχή and σῶμα are essential to the complete personality : that it cannot exist in the one without the other. A further deduction can be

safely ventured: that what is true for the possession of an entire personality in this world is true also of the one into which the dead pass.

There are two realms of the dead in the Homeric poems. Relatively to one another they are as Heaven and Hell; but the one is happiness without reward and the other is misery without punishment. Neither has any bearing upon this present life, nor does a man's character here determine his destination.

The Under World is a prison of unmitigated gloom. It lies remote, beyond the deep stream of Okeanos, amidst the Kimerioi, whose city is shrouded in endless, starless night (*Od.* xi, 14–19). Its entrance is by the groves of Persephone, amidst poplars and willows shedding their fruit before it ripens. Over it rules the most loathly of the gods, Hades.

> Ἀΐδης τοι ἀμείλιχος ἠδ' ἀδάμαστος·
> τοὔνεκα καί τε βροτοῖσι θεῶν ἔχθιστος ἁπάντων.
>
> *Il.* ix. 158-159.

Its dwellings are gruesome, abominable to gods and men:

> σμερδαλέ', εὐρώεντα, τάτε στυγέουσι θεοί περ.
>
> *Il.* xx. 65.

Its meadows are dreary asphodel, and watered by Acheron, Pyriphlegethon, Kokytos, and Styx. The very names made the Greek shudder with horror. Everything that could arouse loathing and disgust was there. The inhabitants were shadows, with shadow voices and shadow strength.

> τοὶ δὲ σκιαὶ ἀΐσσουσιν. *Od.* x. 495.
>
> ταὶ δὲ τρίζουσαι ἔποντο. *Od.* xxiv. 5.

They are ἀμενηνὰ κάρηνα (*Od.* xi, 29) with as much substance as ἀμενηνῶν ὀνείρων. They are as unintelligent as they are weak; mere reflections of existence.

> πῶς ἔτλης Ἀϊδόσδε κατελθέμεν, ἔνθα τε νεκροὶ
> ἀφραδέες ναίουσι, βροτῶν εἴδωλα καμόντων;
>
> *Od.* xi. 475-6.

And poverty on earth, or oppression or slavery, would be better than to be monarch over those empty, dreary realms where everything is spectral except their dreariness. The creatures inhabiting the place were dead, yet thought themselves alive.

There is only one brief reference to a different world for the departed ; nevertheless, it is somewhere in the beyond, and some shall find it.

> σοὶ δ' οὐ θέσφατόν ἐστι, διοτρεφὲς ὦ Μενέλαε,
> Ἄργει ἐν ἱπποβότῳ θανέειν καὶ πότμον ἐπισπεῖν,
> ἀλλά σ' ἐς Ἠλύσιον πεδίον καὶ πείρατα γαίης
> ἀθάνατοι πέμψουσιν, ὅθι ξανθὸς Ῥαδάμανθυς,
> τῇ περ ῥηίστη βιοτὴ πέλει ἀνθρώποισιν·
> οὐ νιφετὸς, οὔτ' ἂρ χειμὼν πολὺς οὔτε ποτ' ὄμβρος,
> ἀλλ' αἰεὶ Ζεφύροιο λιγὺ πνείοντας ἀήτας
> Ὠκεανὸς ἀνίησιν ἀναψύχειν ἀνθρώπους. *Od.* iv. 561-8.

Though the reason for this blessing being vouchsafed unto him is not because of merit in himself, but

> οὕνεκ' ἔχεις Ἑλένην καί σφιν γαμβρὸς Διός ἐσσι.
> *Od.* iv. 569.

The memory of that fair world had also come to men from out of a remote past, and had been well-nigh extinguished as a hope for mortals, utterly extinguished for ordinary men, yet it could not be utterly forgotten. The Homeric poems are a reflection of the life of men, consequently that gleam of sunshine flits across the mirror.

The dual funeral customs, the duality of human personality, the two realms of the dead are co-related respectively, according to their origin. There was a religion of gladness and there was a religion of sadness : the one was with the autochthonous peoples, the other came with the invading Achæans. Those who saw the visions of a future bliss desired to possess it and to enjoy it with the body that was necessary for its enjoyment. They buried the bodies of their dead in the hope that by burial they might be utilized for the felicity of a world of material enjoyments and fulness of bodily life. Those who believed in a world of shadows sent the shadow man to possess it.

That realm was no place for bodies: it was scarce endurable for the shadow being, the half of the sensuous life. They cremated their dead, believing that thereby the spirit was duly liberated and sent by appropriate means to its spiritual destination.

The difference of belief implied a difference in psychology. Those that believed that the body was to possess the eternal world believed also that a man's personality was enshrined in it here. Those who held that the spirit was the immortal part regarded that as the very man here.

The two religious creeds, the two sets of funeral customs, and the two psychologies struggled for survival, as sternly as Zeus and his comrade deities fought against the local deities, whose domains they had invaded. The results were much the same in each case. The new coalesced with the old, yet vanquished it. The old survived in the new and shared its throne. It defied defeat.

The two strains of thought, the two currents of feeling have become merged, yet like the Black Lutschine and the White Lutschine at Interlaken, where they have become one, the different spheres of their origin can be traced. Each has taken on something of the other, yet it can be discerned that they are not one but two.

Who would wish to enter those freezing realms of woe in the Under World with its travesty of life and mockery of existence? Yet that is what Patroklos begs for. His soul had gone to Hades, and like the rest he sorrowed at his going. He is not admitted because his funeral rites had not been discharged; he returns, therefore, to his comrade, chides him, appeals to him by his old love to give him his last obsequies, so that he may have his desire to pass the gates of Hades and mingle with the spirits that now drive him from them.

εὕδεις, αὐτὰρ ἐμεῖο λελασμένος ἔπλευ, Ἀχιλλεῦ;
οὐ μέν μευ ζώοντος ἀκήδεις, ἀλλὰ θανόντος·
θάπτε με ὅττι τάχιστα, πύλας Ἀΐδαο περήσω.
τῆλέ μ' εἴργουσι ψυχαί, εἴδωλα καμόντων,
οὐδέ μέ πω μίσγεσθαι ὑπὲρ ποταμοῖο ἐῶσιν,
ἀλλ' αὖτως ἀλάλημαι ἀν' εὐρυπυλὲς Ἄϊδος δῶ.

Il. xxiii. 69-74.

The appeal is a startling contradiction : he was better off as he was, and the ghosts that excluded him from that dread world were doing him a kindness.

The explanation is that the language of men had been dragged from its anchorage. Like *θάπτομεν*, it had been transferred from one thing to another, related, yet quite different. Patroklos was using the speech of the religion of gladness and transferring it to the realms of sadness. There had been a time when men could imagine themselves coming back to the world they had left to supplicate from their friends, in the name of everything that was dear, the means of entering into their immortal felicity. The language persisted after the reality had faded away. The conquering creed had brought a new after-world, but the old speech lived on the lips of men, and they said they dreaded being expelled from the world of the hereafter by the souls that dwelt there. But those souls were not spectral shades, twittering and flitting.

The heroes who defend the walls of Troy, and those who attack them, have a common horror of their dead body falling to the dogs and the carrion crows. Achilleus flings the threat at Hektor:

> *σὲ μὲν κύνες ἠδ' οἰωνοὶ*
> *ἑλκήσουσ' ἀικῶς, τὸν δὲ κτεριοῦσιν Ἀχαιοί.*

In answer Hektor makes the appeal :

> *λίσσομ' ὑπὲρ ψυχῆς καὶ γούνων σῶν τε τοκήων,*
> *μή με ἔα παρὰ νηυσὶ κύνας καταδάψαι Ἀχαιῶν,*
> *ἀλλὰ σὺ μὲν χαλκόν τε ἅλις χρυσόν τε δέδεξο,*
> *δῶρα τά τοι δώσουσι πατὴρ καὶ πότνια μήτηρ,*
> *σῶμα δὲ οἴκαδ' ἐμὸν δόμεναι πάλιν, ὄφρα πυρός με*
> *Τρῶες καὶ Τρώων ἄλοχοι λελάχωσι θανόντα.*
>
> *Il.* xxii. 338-43.

The horror was not so much of the ignominy suffered by the corpse, but that its discrete parts would not be able to enter the realms beyond. Hektor dies, and according to the usual formula,

> *ψυχὴ δ' ἐκ ῥεθέων πταμένη Ἀϊδόσδε βεβήκει,*
> *ὃν πότμον γοόωσα, λιποῦσ' ἀδροτῆτα καὶ ἥβην.*
>
> *Il.* xxii. 362-3.

There speaks the poet who is on the side of the Olympians, but the soldiers speak a language preserving the old theology and it cannot be excluded from their speeches. The poet of the new theology may despatch the phantom soul to the realm of phantoms, but the soldiers, speaking the language surviving from the time when the people looked for the possibility of a substantial bliss in a substantial world, dread the loss of that bliss through their body being deprived of the capacity of entering into it, more than they dread death at the hand of their enemy; and the knowledge that the victor can deprive his foe of life in that world as well as in this gives a fuller sweetness to his victory.

The purpose both of cremation and burial was to despatch the dead to their proper world; but while that purpose was primary in the one case it was but secondary in the other. Those who believed in a world where the inhabitants lived in never-ending bliss would perform the funeral rites out of affection for their dead. They were sending their loved ones into the kingdom they themselves expected to reach in due time through a similar piety on the part of their survivors. Those, on the other hand, who believed in a mere shadow land would have little desire to send their dead thither, any more than they would wish to go themselves. They are despatched to their dreary meadows lest a worse fate befall the living: the dead would come back to repossess their former body and haunt in horrible shape their former world. The burial in the religion of gladness was a viaticum to the dead, to enable them to pass hence to a land from which they would not desire to return: the burning pyre of the religion of sadness was to send the dead hence, so that they should not be able to return thence to afflict their survivors on earth.

There is at least one hint in the Homeric poems of the dead returning to earth with woeful purpose towards those who had withheld from them their final dues. Elpenor, when he appeals to Odysseus not to leave his body unburied and without the customary lamentations, adds:

μή τοί τι θεῶν μήνιμα γένωμαι. *Od.* xi. 73.

Hektor says the same thing to Achilleus in answer to his threats to cast his body to the beasts and birds. The word μήνιμα is usually translated "a cause of divine wrath," and the phrase is thus made to mean "The gods will curse you for my sake." It is a singularly indirect way of saying it, especially for both a poet and a character who have a keen directness of speech. It should more probably signify not so much the cause of divine wrath as the means of inflicting it: for depriving the dead of the felicity due to them in the one case, and for depriving Hades of his rightful subjects in the other.

Chapter VI. The Third Estate of the Dead

NEITHER the Greek nor the native of the land whom he displaced ever doubted the survival of the dead: his fear was that they might survive in the wrong place and continue to frequent the world they ought to have left. If a dead man came back to his old haunts it would be with no friendly feelings. If he had justification for his animosity his presence was the more to be dreaded.

The working of this fear is seen in the gruesome practice followed by murderers. They cut off the hands and feet of their victims, or perhaps their arms and legs, for *μασχαλίζειν* might mean either. The violent death and the absence of the ritual of burial deprived the dead man of his body, an essential thing as the vehicle of his being, and inseparable from his individuality. It was to a large extent himself; it was more than *αὐτόν*, it was *αὐτός*.

The homeless soul, the wanderer without a habitation, seeks to enter its former abode, the only one available to it, that it may live an attenuated and shadowy existence, yet the only one permitted to it in which it can have but one satisfaction—revenge.

The murderer saves himself from the attacks of his victim by mutilating him. There is no power in a spirit that has a body without hands or feet. His means of self-defence were as horrible as the murder, but the shedder of blood felt himself driven to it.

Atreus slays the children of his exiled brother, and cuts off their hands and feet:

> *τὰ μὲν ποδήρη καὶ χερῶν ἄκρους κτένας*
> *ἔκρυπτ' ἄνωθεν ἀνδρακὰς καθήμενος*
> *ἄσημ'· ὁ δ' αὐτῶν αὐτίκ' ἀγνοίᾳ λαβὼν*
> *ἔσθει βορὰν ἄσωτον, ὡς ὁρᾷς, γένει.*
>
> *Agam.* 1594-97.

That was in self-defence. He serves their flesh to their father: that was to make him know the abyssmal horror of his lot. After temporally concealing the amputated extremities, as tradition affirms, and as the above statement would imply, reading *ἔκρυπτ'* for *ἔθρυπτ'*, he discloses them to the father: that was to crown the

father's horror with despair. The satisfaction of revenge could no more come from them than from himself. Herodotus has an almost identical story about Harpagos and Astyages (i, 119). The same mutilation is performed; the extremities are first concealed, that the full revelation might be made at the close of the banquet.

Klytaimnestra knew the same method, and put it into practice against Agamemnon:

ἐμασχαλίσθη δέ γ', ὡς τόδ' εἰδῇς,
ἔπρασσε δ' ᾗπέρ νιν ὧδε θάπτει,
μόρον κτίσαι μωμένα
ἄφερτον αἰῶνι σῷ.
κλύεις πατρῴους δύας ἀτίμους. *Cho.* 439-43.

Orestes is to know the worst, ὡς τόδ' εἰδῇς, no help can come from Agamemnon. He is the appointed avenger of blood; he must rely on his own strong hand alone. The helplessness of his father made his obligation the greater, and his loneliness made his work the harder. The scholiast says:

δυστυχίαν μεγίστην κατασκευάσουσα τῷ σῷ βίῳ, ὦ Ὀρέστα.

When he has come to his father's tomb the only prayer he can offer is:

ὦ γαῖ', ἄνες μοι πατέρ' ἐποπτεῦσαι μάχην. *Cho.* 489.

After what he had been told he knew that his father could be no more than a spectator of the struggle. Electra had the same knowledge, and her petition is to Persephone for her help towards the victory:

ὦ Περσέφασσα, δὸς δέ γ' εὔμορφον κράτος. *Cho.* 490.

Both brother and sister realize that the human protagonist is alone; the gods may help, the spirit of the dead king may watch, but there is no avenger except the man himself.

Sophocles makes no reference to the mutilation, consequently he can make Electra say to Chrysothemis:

αἰτοῦ δὲ προσπίτνουσα γῆθεν εὐμενῆ
ἡμῖν ἀρωγὸν αὐτὸν εἰς ἐχθροὺς μολεῖν. *Elec.* 453-4.

The dead man can come back and be more than a spectator of the falling vengeance : he has not been deprived of the means of helping his children against his murderers.

There is an awful scene, chilling in its horror, between the outraged Medeia and her faithless husband, while the children, just slain at her hands, are lying at their feet. The mother, gloating that she has been able to inflict suffering upon him by killing them, says :

οἵδ' οὐκέτ' εἰσί· τοῦτο γάρ σε δήξεται.

He replies in equal triumph that they still are, and that upon her they will work their vengeance.

οἵδ' εἰσὶν, οἴμοι, σῷ κάρᾳ μιάστορες.

Eur. Med. 1370-1.

They need no help : the mother's hand that slew them has armed them with their awful power, and did not have the daring to disarm them. They themselves, and not another, will exact vengeance. He can depart from the stage, calling upon Zeus to behold how the lioness will not suffer him to approach the dead bodies of his own children, but he does nothing ; there is no need : the mighty dead will do more than he can. The mother leaves the stage holding the dead in her arms : no vengeance from god or man smites her, but the spectators knew that out of the grave the pursuers shall arise to inflict upon her punishments more terrible than can be shown in the theatre. She had vowed

μὰ τοὺς παρ' Ἅιδῃ νερτέρους ἀλάστορας.

Med. 1059.

She passes off the scene bearing two of them in her arms.

The belief which lay behind the awful tragedies of the legendary period of Greece survived with undiminished potency into the day of its intellectual splendour. It was not an offspring of darkness, to perish in the light. The highest mind of the race, when laying down laws for the ideal state, recognizes it.

παλαιὸν δέ τινα τῶν ἀρχαίων μύθων λεγόμενον μὴ ἀτιμαζέτω.

Pl. *Leges*, 865 D.

The man who has died a violent death can be the tormentor of the homicide, as well as a guilty conscience.

λέγεται δὲ ὡς ὁ θανατωθεὶς ἄρα βιαίως, ἐν ἐλευθέρῳ φρονήματι βεβιωκώς, θυμοῦταί τε τῷ δράσαντι νεοθνὴς ὤν, καὶ φόβου καὶ δείματος ἅμα διὰ τὴν βίαιον πάθην αὐτὸς πεπληρωμένος, ὁρῶν τε τὸν ἑαυτοῦ φονέα ἐν τοῖς ἤθεσι τοῖς τῆς ἑαυτοῦ συνηθείας ἀναστρεφόμενον δειμαίνει, καὶ ταραττόμενος αὐτὸς ταράττει κατὰ δύναμιν πᾶσαν τὸν δράσαντα, μνήμην ξύμμαχον ἔχων, αὐτόν τε καὶ τὰς πράξεις αὐτοῦ. *Leges*, 865 D.E.

Therefore the doer of the ill deed, though he be but an involuntary homicide, shall withdraw himself from the neighbourhood for a full year. It is safety for him, and expedient for the community.

Plato is justifying the retention of a law of Athens that seemed somewhat harsh (*cf.* Demosth. *in Arist.*, 634, 643). It was to provide for the satisfaction due to the dead man; for if the state did not enforce it, he might himself, and that would be worse for the state.

The man guilty of murder cannot be let off so lightly. The wrath of the dead against the unintentional manslayer is placable; the wrath of the murdered against the deliberate murderer is implacable and inexorable. The evil-doer must bear the same suffering as his victim; he robbed a soul of its possibility of happiness in the hereafter; he shall lose his likewise.

δράσαντί τι τοιοῦτον παθεῖν ταὐτὰ ἀναγκαίως ἅ περ ἔδρασεν. *Leges*, 872 E.

τοῦ γὰρ κοινοῦ μιανθέντος αἵματος οὐκ εἶναι κάθαρσιν ἄλλην, οὐδὲ ἔκπλυτον ἐθέλειν γίγνεσθαι τὸ μιανθὲν πρὶν φόνον φόνῳ ὁμοίῳ ὅμοιον ἡ δράσασα ψυχὴ τίσῃ, καὶ πάσης τῆς ξυγγενείας τὸν θυμὸν ἀφιλασαμένη κοιμίσῃ. *Leges*, 872 E. 873 A.

ἐὰν δέ τις ὄφλῃ φόνου τοιούτου τούτων κτείνας τινά, οἱ μὲν τῶν δικαστῶν ὑπηρέται καὶ ἄρχοντες ἀποκτείναντες εἰς τεταγμένην τρίοδον ἔξω τῆς πόλεως ἐκβαλλόντων γυμνόν, αἱ δὲ ἀρχαὶ πᾶσαι ὑπὲρ ὅλης τῆς πόλεως, λίθον ἕκαστος φέρων, ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν τοῦ νεκροῦ βάλλων ἀφοσιούτω τὴν πόλιν ὅλην, μετὰ δὲ τοῦτο εἰς τὰ τῆς χώρας ὅρια φέροντες ἐκβαλλόντων τῷ νόμῳ ἄταφον. *Leges*, 873 B.C.

It is like vindictive savagery rather than the legislation of an advanced philosophic circle at Athens. Yet it is neither savage nor vindictive: Plato is holding the scales of Justice with an even hand. To take the murderer's life and stop there would be to give him entrance into relative felicity, while the guiltless victim of his crime passed into nameless torments. He, too, must be made to suffer after he has endured the ignominious and violent death and become a wandering outcast in the realms of the unseen that border upon the visible world. It is only by this complete equality of justice that the crime can be expiated and the curse averted from the city.

The law courts of the city were familiar with the idea. Antiphon, in urging a jury to bring in a verdict of guilty against a man charged with murder, ventures to threaten that the murdered man's wrath will fall upon those who, by acquitting the murderer, make themselves the accomplices of his crime. It is not mere rhetoric, nor a daring prosopopeia of impassioned eloquence, but an argument based upon the facts of life as they were understood by the citizens to whom it was addressed.

It is noticeable that the Furies discharge functions similar to those feared from the dead human avenger. They are

> κόραι δυστυχεῖς
> Νυκτὸς ἀτιμοπενθεῖς. *Eum.* 791-2.

They are of that world which is neither above nor below, neither of the gods nor of men; perhaps they are the embodiment of the murdered ones. Æschylus makes the chorus of them say:

> ἐγὼ δ' ἄτιμος ἁ τάλαινα βαρύκοτος
> ἐν γᾷ τᾷδε, φεῦ,
> ἰὸν ἰὸν ἀντιπενθῆ μεθεῖσα καρδίας
> σταλαγμὸν χθονὶ
> ἄφορον· ἐκ δὲ τοῦ λειχὴν ἄφυλλος,
> ἄτεκνος, ἰὼ δίκα, πέδον ἐπισύμενος
> βροτοφθόρους κηλῖδας ἐν χώρᾳ βαλεῖ. *Eum.* 780-6.

The murdered citizen, unto whom his state had not done justice, might use the same words. The Furies were his

representatives : they all came from that Third Realm of the Dead, spoke its language, and did its deeds. They were all equally repulsive, equally powerful, and equally to be dreaded.

In the *Medeia* the murdered dead are called μιάστορες, The Pollutors ; elsewhere they are called ἀλάστορες, The Wanderers. The derivation of the latter word from λανθάνω, λήθω, by way of a hypothetical negative, is well-nigh impossible. Its derivation through ἄλαστος ought to give ἀλάστηρ. The word stands in the same relation to ἀλάομαι, ἀλαίνω, as μιάστωρ does to μιαίνω.

There is the possibility that the word is a foreign one. There are three heroes who are called by that name in the *Iliad* : a Lykian (v, 677), a leader of the Pylians (iv, 295), and the father of Tros (xx, 463). One line in which the name occurs suggests the possibility that it once had the digamma

ἀμφὶ μέγαν Πελάγοντα Ϝαλάστορά τε Χρομίον τε.
iv. 295.

Though the hiatus may be one that falls occasionally after the trochaic cæsura, or it may be a licence in the treatment of a proper name. The other lines in which the name occurs,

εἷλεν Ϝαλάστορα. v. 677.

καὶ δῖος Ϝαλάστωρ. viii. 333.

and where there is no trace of the digamma, do not necessarily prove that it never existed. Other words that incontrovertibly had it sometimes show the loss of it and at other times do not. If this name once had it, the conclusion would be reasonably clear that it was of foreign origin, like many other proper names. It would be a vain endeavour then to discover its meaning, applicable to the living hero and the implacable dead. If the word be derived from ἀλάομαι, it would be appropriate enough to some of those freebooters and marauders and moss-troopers. Later the word is reserved for the special Wanderer who comes out of the Kingdom of the Dead, while ἀλήτης develops into the general term.

Klytaimnestra laments *αἰσχρῶς δ' ἀλῶμαι* after she has become a ghost. She is an outcast wanderer cut off in dishonour from the realms where the rest of the dead abide.

> *ἐγὼ δ' ὑφ' ὑμῶν ὧδ' ἀπητιμασμένη*
> *ἄλλοισιν ἐν νεκροῖσιν, ὧν μὲν ἔκτανον*
> *ὄνειδος ἐν φθιτοῖσιν οὐκ ἐκλείπεται,*
> *αἰσχρῶς δ' ἀλῶμαι· προὐννέπω δ' ὑμῖν ὅτι*
> *ἔχω μεγίστην αἰτίαν κείνων ὕπο.* *Eum.* 95-99.

She was faring as she had wrought.

The association of *ἀλάστωρ* with *ἀλαίνω* is shown also in the lament of the captive wife over her husband slain in battle, and whose body shared the common fate of the vanquished fallen :

> *σὺ μὲν φθίμενος ἀλαίνεις*
> *ἄθαπτος, ἄνυδρος.* *Tro.* 1084.

That was the fate of the dead who received not their funeral rites ; their doom was to wander ; they themselves were the Wanderers, of all the dead the most miserable. Some of them, like the guilty queen, deserved their fate ; they were the abomination of both the living and the dead : others did not ; they were the subject for tears, yet no tears could relieve their fate. Prayers availed not, for they were under the dominion of none of the gods ; they were the rejected of all.

The only thing that the living men of this earth could do was to placate them. They might be wandering anywhere ; no one knew where. Around ancient burial places certainly, for ever seeking, and seeking in vain, for the bodily habitation which was theirs.

The place of one's home might, perchance, be the scene of some ancient crime. Some peasant Medeia or village Klytaimnestra might have wrought her furious deed in the street of one's town, or in the fields around it. There had been awful times : people killed each other frequently enough. The very house where one's children were might have been the scene of some such crime, and an illuminated Kassandra might see the ghosts of the slain hovering over its roof-tree. Every family, if only the

records could be traced, had amongst its ancestors some whose hands were stained with the blood of a friend or an innocent foe. The ἀλάστορες might be under a man's own roof. It was well to appease them and avert their malignancy; it was all that could be done, for nothing could convert them to benevolence. Their doom was past remedy; their wrath was as enduring as their fate.

Once a year the task of placation was solemnly performed. It was during the μιαραὶ ἡμέραι, the Pollution Days of the Anthesteria. Dead men's food was prepared for the polluting Wanderers, of which no living being could partake. Blood was poured out to them, for it was pleasing to them. Blood was life; perhaps the drinking of blood imparted to their attenuated, yet potent, existence the semblance and sensation of the life they had lost but could not regain; perhaps it assuaged their undying thirst for vengeance. At any rate, it had some influence with the dissatisfied spirits of the restless, homeless dead.

> δέξαι χοάς μοι τάσδε κληδηρίους,
> νεκρῶν ἀγωγούς· ἐλθὲ δ', ὡς πίῃς μέλαν
> κόρης ἀκραιφνὲς αἷμ', ὅ σοι δωρούμεθα
> στρατός τε κἀγώ· πρευμενὴς δ' ἡμῖν γενοῦ . . .
>
> *Hec.* 535-8.

Such was the appeal made to the angry ghost of Achilleus. Better the death of a single captive than the affliction of a whole army. In that instance it was known whence the demand came, but who knew the Wandering Dead of one's own town, or farm, or home? Who could point to the human victims they demanded? Probably they, too, were all dead. Blood might still satisfy their cravings and secure to the living a year's exemption from their malevolence.

The apostle Paul, when he proclaimed on the Areopagos his message to the Athenians, fell into a curious blunder, yet not an unnatural one to the Jew. He is asserting that God had appointed Jesus to judge in righteousness of the whole world, in demonstration of which he had raised Him from the dead (Acts xvii, 31). The

Greeks knew an *ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν*, but it was of *μιάστορες*, *ἀλάστορες*. To become a Klytaimnestra, or a Polydoros even, or an old hag on the comic stage, was the opposite of being appointed unto divine honour.

> *ἀτὰρ τί τὸ πρᾶγμ' ἔστ', ἀντιβολῶ, τουτί ποτε ;*
> *πότερον πίθηκος ἀνάπλεως ψιμυθίου,*
> *ἢ γραῦς ἀνεστηκυῖα παρὰ τῶν πλειόνων ;*
>
> *Aristoph. Eccles.* 1071-3.

It was more grotesque than the most absurd scene from a comedy. It was worse than a divine crucifixion, reference to which the apostle apparently avoided.

The belief in the homeless, wandering, vengeful dead belonged to the origins of religion. It was a *παλαιὸς λόγος*, something that had come out of the twilight of antiquity that was far remote when Plato was drafting his ideal laws for an ideal state : it was as much an intense reality to the spectators in the theatre as it had been to the legendary heroes represented there. It was before any worshipper of Zeus built his altar on Greek soil. It was primitive, aboriginal.

It indicated a religion of dread, yet of assurance : dread of beings who became more powerful through death than they had been in life ; assurance of immortality as the destiny of the living. But the dread enthralled more than the hope encouraged. The people who held it first held it as one of the main elements of their creed, and with but few ameliorating associations. They were in the same stage of religious development as the uncivilized tribes of to-day. The Papuan savage has the same fears of his dead, and practises almost the same kind of propitiatory rites. The soul of man expresses itself universally in the same language, and creates for itself the same invisible environment.

The notable achievement of the Hellenic race was that it advanced with comparative rapidity into higher conceptions. The primal beliefs continued to cling to its soul like mire to a garment, but it was conscious that it was meet to wear a crown, and was fashioning one for itself to wear.

Chapter VII. Intercourse with the Unseen

IN a world where κῆρες, unseen and ubiquitous, were able to hurt a man, consequently to promote his welfare at least negatively, and perhaps actively if they were benevolently disposed or if means could be devised to compel them, there would naturally arise the desire to avert their baneful antagonism and to win their assistance. Both were accomplished in the case of the regnant deities by offering them pleasing sacrifices, that passed into the unseen world where they dwelt and refreshed them. Even Hebraism retained this conception until the time of the final redaction of the story of the Flood :

καὶ ὠσφράνθη κύριος ὁ θεὸς ὀσμὴν εὐωδίας.

LXX. *Gen.* viii. 21.

The lesser orders of beings merited no such treatment. They were to be snared or expelled by fumigations, scents, and besoms. To some extent they could be controlled ; therefore, perchance, they might be harnessed to the chariots of information that came from the other world.

They were not gods who πάντα δύνανται, nor πάντα ἴσασιν (*Od.* iv, 379, 468), but they were powerful enough to kill a man ; they were more clever than mortals, for they moved in the domain whence the invisible things come, and all events of life after a few steps backward touched the inscrutable and invisible ; and in addition to these qualities they had some measure of independent action, for did they not always await for the behests of the gods ? The arts of vaticination were the attempts to devise a yoke that would fit their shoulders.

When Greece had received a Theogony portents became associated in a loose and indefinite way with the new Olympian gods. The eagle was the messenger of Zeus, the hawk (κίρκος) was

Ἀπόλλωνος ταχὺς ἄγγελος.

Od. xv. 526.

and the Pythoness his mouthpiece. These were but endeavours to place immemorial customs on a religious foundation. All people do that : Cicero did it, and

declared he would believe, though he could not explain :

> Quid fibra valeat, accipio ; quae causa sit, nescio.
>
> *de Div.* i. 10.

The medicine man of the savage does the same thing.

The κῆρες were there before Zeus sat upon his Olympian throne, or Apollo sent his arrows over Greece, or ever an oracle was delivered. Where there are no gods there can be no inspiration : messages from them are non-existent ; but a κῆρ who is going to injure a man on his journey, or blast his cattle, might be constrained to give up its secret ; it might even be constantly blurting it out to him, if he could understand the language that was being spoken to him from the sky and the earth. Divination in the first instance was not communion with the great gods, but with the little, and it never entirely lost that character.

Legendary theology ascribed the revelation of the mantic arts to Prometheus, and devoutly invented the list of his gifts :

> τρόπους τε πολλοὺς μαντικῆς ἐστοίχισα,
> κἄκρινα πρῶτος ἐξ ὀνειράτων ἃ χρὴ
> ὕπαρ γενέσθαι, κληδόνας τε δυσκρίτους
> ἐγνώρισ' αὐτοῖς· ἐνοδίους τε συμβόλους
> γαμψωνύχων τε πτῆσιν οἰωνῶν σκεθρῶς
> διώρισ', οἵτινές τε δεξιοὶ φύσιν
> εὐωνύμους τε, καὶ δίαιταν ἥντινα
> ἔχουσ' ἕκαστοι, καὶ πρὸς ἀλλήλους τίνες
> ἔχθραι τε καὶ στέργηθρα καὶ συνεδρίαι·
> σπλάγχνων τε λειότητα, καὶ χροιὰν τίνα
> ἔχοντ' ἂν εἴη δαίμοσιν πρὸς ἡδονὴν,
> χολῆς λοβοῦ τε ποικίλην εὐμορφίαν,
> κνίσῃ τε κῶλα συγκαλυπτὰ καὶ μακρὰν
> ὀσφῦν πυρώσας δυστέκμαρτον ἐς τέχνην
> ὤδωσα θνητούς· καὶ φλογωπὰ σήματα
> ἐξωμμάτωσα, πρόσθεν ὄντ' ἐπάργεμα.
>
> *Prom. V* 484-99.

The association of the things enumerated here with Prometheus is an indication, if any were needed, of the

belief in their hoary antiquity. They had come down through the ages from the time of the Titans, and antedated Zeus himself.

The first Prometheus, however, was not the son of Iapetos, but the hungry hunter eager about his food he was stalking over the hills and the shepherd anxious about the weather for his flocks. A casual phenomenon and an event were observed to concur : the one was construed as a prognostication of the other. If the croaking of a half-grown frog were a warning about the weather, every sound in the woods and the heavens might be a veritable κληδών, having significance for the listener.

What the most primitive forms of divination were cannot be surmised even, for they defy rational investigation : all that can be done is to take the forms current in the historical period and deduce from them the general character of their ancestry. One thing is certain : the youngest of them are ancient.

Any casual incident might provide the means of prognostication, for the κῆρες were in one place as much as another. Just as Aristophanes says that anything can be an ὄρνις (*Aves*, 720). The not uncommon sight of a snake in the house caused satisfaction : it showed that the guardian spirit was watching over it. The association between snake and κῆρες great and little was always most intimate. A dog howling at night set the people wondering who would die next :

> Θέστυλι, ταὶ κύνες ἄμμιν ἀνὰ πτόλιν ὠρύονται.
> ἀ θεὸς ἐν τριόδοισι. *Theok. Id.* ii. 35.

Idle eyes watched the fire during the winter nights, and the minds were turned to speculation. The way the logs crackled and flung their sparks meant something, and good news or trouble were deduced from the omens. They are both frequent enough in this world to justify the omens. The spluttering of a candle meant much the same things (*Propert.* iv, 3, 60). The spilling of oil meant the coming of poverty, but the spilling of wine meant that plenty was near at hand. A weasel seen upon the gable of a man's house, or crossing his path, filled

him with dismay (*Theophr. Chr.* xvi, 1). The throbbing of a man's eye meant that he would soon see someone: if it were the right eye a friend, and presumably an enemy if it were the other eye:

> ἄλλεται ὀφθαλμός μευ ὁ δεξιός· ἆρά γ' ἰδησῶ
> αὐτάν; *Theok. Id.* iii. 37-8.

When his ears buzzed they were telling him that he was being talked about—favourably if it were the right ear, unfavourably if it were the left. A sneeze might be a portent of the first order:

> εἰ δ' Ὀδυσεὺς ἔλθοι καὶ ἵκοιτ' ἐς πατρίδα γαῖαν,
> αἶψά κε σὺν ᾧ παιδὶ βίας ἀποτίσεται ἀνδρῶν.
> ὣς φάτο, Τηλέμαχος δὲ μέγ' ἔπταρεν, ἀμφὶ δὲ δῶμα
> σμερδαλέον κονάβησε· γέλασσε δὲ Πηνελόπεια,
> αἶψα δ' ἄρ' Εὔμαιον ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα·
> ἔρχεό μοι, τὸν ξεῖνον ἐναντίον ὧδε κάλεσσον.
> οὐχ ὁράᾳς ὅ μοι υἱὸς ἐπέπταρε πᾶσιν ἔπεσσιν;
> τῷ κε καὶ οὐκ ἀτελὴς θάνατος μνηστῆρσι γένοιτο
> πᾶσι μάλ', οὐδέ κέ τις θάνατον καὶ κῆρας ἀλύξοι.
> *Od.* xvii. 539-47.

When Xenophon was addressing his soldiers one of them sneezed as he spoke the word *σωτηρίας*, whereupon all the army did reverence to the god that had manifested himself, and the religious-minded Xenophon proclaimed the interpretation:

> δοκεῖ μοι, ὦ ἄνδρες, ἐπεὶ περὶ σωτηρίας ἡμῶν λεγόντων
> οἰωνὸς τοῦ Διὸς τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἐφάνη, εὔξασθαι τῷ θεῷ
> τούτῳ θύσειν σωτήρια. *Xen. Exped. Cyr.* iii. 2-9.

The soldiers were immediately encouraged. That was probably the most important sneeze in history.

There is no rationalizing the connection between the omen and the event: it is arbitrary and sentimental. The omen might just as well mean something else. All primitive people have acted in the same manner, and it is a long time before the enlightened posterity is able to escape from the legacy. Superstition never dies, or it has not died yet, but it is seldom that a new one is created,

or being created has a long life. The primitive ones are singularly tenacious of life: they are so elemental.

The Greek in every age had a large share of this quality; he always wanted to get into touch with the unseen. He was prepared to walk any path that offered the promise of conducting him thither. He would examine the gall-bladder of his sacrifice, listen to the note of a bird, stand by an altar, or lift his hands in prayer with equal confidence. Paul told them that they were δεισιδαιμονεστέρους, and the word did not give them offence. They had inherited the reverent fear from their remotest ancestry; they had changed the object but little. For κῆρες they had substituted δαίμονες, but the greater had not expelled the lesser. Monotheism followed upon polytheism, but both κῆρες and δαίμονες are inextricably entangled with the worship of the Greek of to-day.

Several of the methods of intercourse with the unseen world that became important enough to assume specified forms, and which illustrate the earliest aspects of religious life, will now be considered.

For all peoples dreams have come out of that far-off land of the invisible, which is nevertheless near at hand. At the stage of evolution, when some of the elements of Greek religion had been systematized, a dream was a divine thing: it was θεῖος ὄνειρος. With many other offices Zeus took over the function of the Giver of Dreams. Ὄνειρος becomes his messenger, as much as Iris or Hermes. He found him a definite being, having voice, and motion, and distinctive individuality. Which would seem to indicate that Dreamland had been a kingdom apart, where Oneiros was Overlord. It became the province of the greater empire of the victorious Zeus, and its monarch his satellite.

He sent the dream to Agamemnon, and Oneiros is his obedient messenger. It was a false one, despite its divine origin, and the bearer of the lie did not object to it. Men of ancient times did not hesitate to ascribe human failings and artifices to their gods. A prophet of singular courage in Israel's history could venture to describe Jahveh as putting a lying spirit into the mouth of Ahab's prophets

so that he should go to his ruin. The Hebrew and the Greek story are the same : all races pass through the same experiences, though they do not reach the same goal.

Dreams are such elusive things : they may mean anything, and some hypothesis is needed to cover man's blundering interpretations, other than the one that the blundering is his own. The fault is transferred to the god that gives the dream, sadly to the detriment of his integrity.

The great issues of life and of the state were supposed to be intimated by dreams. The chorus in the *Agamemnon* asks Klytaimnestra whether it were in a dream that she received the knowledge that Troy had fallen :

πότερα δ' ὀνείρων φάσματ' εὐπειθῆ σέβεις ; *Aga.* 274.

The strong-minded woman retorts that she is not to be beguiled by the phantasms of a brain oppressed by sleep :

οἰ' δόξαν ἂν λάβοιμι βριζούσης φρενός. *Aga.* 275.

She has more fears of Agamemnon's ghost than of the authors of dreams.

Plato justifies the belief in dreams on the ground that they are a divine manifestation. Aristotle explains them on the same basis in his treatise, περὶ μαντικῆς τῆς ἐν τοῖς ὕπνοις. They are both correlating them with the Olympian theology. Men dreamed their dreams before there came from the north to Greece the race that for long centuries was to be the intellectual light of the world, bringing its gods with it, who sequestrate the current ministry of dreams into their own religious system. Oneiros is given his place amongst the abodes of the gods to disclose their will to men. His communications are

. . . ἀμήχανοι ἀκριτόμυθοι
. . . οὐδέ τι πάντα τελείεται ἀνθρώποισιν.
Od. xix. 560-1.

That is because dull-minded man cannot discern by which gate they enter the soul. The false beguile, but there are those that shall come true :

οἵ ῥ' ἔτυμα κραίνουσι, βροτῶν ὅτε κέν τις ἴδηται. 567.

Not merely if a man should have a vision, but be able to understand that it is authentic.

The popular mind did not need the justifying reasons of the philosophers: the belief in dreams was in their blood. Not everyone was a murderess, like the guilty queen: her dreams in the night must have been disquieting. A less guilty conscience might extract consolation from them. They suited the incipient spiritual character of the people, seeking after intercourse with the invisible world, and dimly conscious that it could be enjoyed through spiritual avenues.

The unseen world was supposed to reveal the future to men through human speech. It was a vague consciousness of the possibility of divine inspiration through the human soul. A chance word might have a god-given significance to the solicitous or inquirihg mind. There was a providence behind the chance. When Odysseus had punished Iros, the braggart beggar that would have kicked him from his own door, the suitors said to him:

> Ζεύς τοι δοίη, ξεῖνε, καὶ ἀθάνατοι θεοὶ ἄλλοι
> ὅ ττι μάλιστ' ἐθέλεις καί τοι φίλον ἔπλετο θυμῷ,
> ὃς τοῦτον τὸν ἄναλτον ἀλητεύειν ἀπέπαυσας
> ἐν δήμῳ. *Od.* xviii. 112-15.

He saw a revelation in the words; the prayer was more than the speakers thought. The sending of the beggar to Echetos was but a way of describing the fate that awaited themselves.

> ὣς ἄρ' ἔφαν, χαῖρεν δὲ κλεηδόνι δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς. 117.

Zeus is probably recognized as the author of the omen on that occasion. The prayer was to him, from whom also one part of the answer came swift upon the prayer.

When Odysseus is nearing the crisis of his single-handed struggle he prays to Zeus:

> Ζεῦ πάτερ, εἴ μ' ἐθέλοντες ἐπὶ τραφερήν τε καὶ ὑγρὴν
> ἤγετ' ἐμὴν ἐς γαῖαν, ἔπειί μ' ἐκακώσατε λίην,
> φήμην τίς μοι φάσθω ἐγειρομένων ἀνθρώπων
> ἔνδοθεν, ἔκτοσθεν δὲ Διὸς τέρας ἄλλο φανήτω.
> *Od.* xx. 98-101.

The god gave the prayer its twofold answer. He sent his thunder from the clear sky :

οὐδέ ποθι νέφος ἐστί,

and he put a message into the mouth of one of the women slaves, which, like the omen in the mouth of the suitors, is in the form of a prayer :

Ζεῦ πάτερ, ὅς τε θεοῖσι καὶ ἀνθρώποισιν ἀνάσσεις,
ἦ μεγάλ' ἐβρόντησας ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ ἀστερόεντος,
οὐδέ ποθι νέφος ἐστί· τέρας νύ τεῳ τόδε φαίνεις.
κρῆνον νῦν καὶ ἐμοὶ δειλῇ ἔπος, ὅ ττί κεν εἴπω·
μνηστῆρες πύματόν τε καὶ ὕστατον ἤματι τῷδε
ἐν μεγάροις Ὀδυσῆος ἑλοίατο δαῖτ' ἐρατεινήν,
οἳ δή μοι καμάτῳ θυμαλγέϊ γούνατ' ἔλυσαν
ἄλφιτα τευχούσῃ· νῦν ὕστατα δειπνήσειαν.

112-19.

The poet had a religious mind, and was a theologian as well : he discerned the god where another would merely see the omen and not trouble about its source.

It was a perilous thing not to recognize a κληδών when it came to a man, as Kleomenes found out to his cost. He designed to take possession of the Athenian Akropolis, but first went to consult the oracle. Before he had crossed the threshold the priestess rose from her place and said to him :

ὦ ξεῖνε Λακεδαιμόνιε, πάλιν χώρει, μηδ' ἔσιθι ἐς τὸ ἱρόν·
οὐ γὰρ θεμιτὸν Δωριεῦσι παριέναι ἐνθαῦτα.

He made the pert and false answer :

ὦ γύναι, ἀλλ' οὐ Δωριεύς εἰμι, ἀλλ' Ἀχαιός.

Hdt. v. 72.

Feeling strong enough to disdain the oracle he had come to consult—such is the inconsistency of the human mind—he disregarded the warning and perished in his attempt.

Even a jest might have serious consequences. The Spartans, in accordance with an oracle received from Delphi, sent a herald to demand satisfaction from Xerxes for the death of Leonidas. The proud king smiled at the

request, and after a long silence pointed to his officer, Mardonios, who was standing near, and said that he would give them the kind of satisfaction that became them.

ὁ μὲν δὴ, δεξάμενος τὸ ῥηθὲν, ἀπαλλάσσετο.
Hdt. viii. 114.

The Lakedaimonians meet Mardonios again at the battle of Platæa, where he dies at the hand of Aimnestos, a Spartan.

ἐνθαῦτα ἥ τε δίκη τοῦ φόνου τοῦ Λεωνίδεω, κατὰ τὸ χρηστήριον, τοῖσι Σπαρτιήτῃσι ἐκ Μαρδονίου ἐπιτελέετο.
Hdt. ix. 64.

At Pheræ the κληδόνες were under the charge of Hermes Agoraios, who gave them in connection with an oracle he had there. The petitioner burnt incense on the sacred hearth, lighted the lamps, and whispered his question into the ear of the statue. He immediately left the temple with his hands firmly covering his ears, and removed them as soon as he was outside (*Paus.* vii, 22, 23). At Thebes Apollo Spodios imparted his oracles in the same fashion (ix, 11, 7).

Apollo and Hermes were not the two gods originally associated with the practice. They are invaders who conquer the local tutelary deity, yet never completely. They expel him from his shrine and take away his honours, but they have to receive him back again, a partner of their throne and participator of their joint titles.

The custom goes back to a distant, indiscernible age when He of the Market-Place and He of the Embers—whatever that strange title may mean—were the presiding deities and held their local sway.

How the original or victorious deities inspired the utterance of their oracles by human lips, or how they brought the listener to the spot at the critical moment, was probably never asked, and certainly never answered. It presupposes communion between the mind of man and the spirit of the divine akin to the conceptions of the prophets of Israel and Judah. They spoke as they were moved by the Spirit of God, but they claimed that they were conscious it was the divine word and not their own.

Had the ancient Pelasgic people, or the Hellenes, who in conquering them assimilated in part their religious practices, confronted the ultimate implications of their own faith they might have shared the world with the Jew as the teachers of a spiritual religion. They might have discerned that the Eternal Spirit verily spoke to men by the lips of men ; not in erratic and ambiguous utterances, but in oracles of righteousness before which the whole world bows in awe. The Greek had an Olympus, but no Sinai ; Kalchas, but no Isaiah.

Again and again he was on the verge of being the pioneer for mankind into spiritual domains, but just as often he turned aside into an easier by-path.

When, in after centuries, some kind of explanation was hazarded for the authenticity of the oracle that cheered the heart of the travel-worn Odysseus, or that warned the man as he stepped from the temple into the market-place, Zeus disappears, and Chance takes his place. Τύχη in the robes of a goddess, began to ascend the steps of the throne of heaven and of man ; or it was merely τὸ τυχεῖν, the impersonal thing. It was from the Greek that Juvenal borrowed his description :

> Nullum numen habes, si sit prudentia ; nos te,
> Nos facimus, Fortuna, Deam coeloque locamus.
>
> x. 365–6.

It was a commonplace, general enough to be current in many forms, of which Polybius has preserved three (ii, 38, 5 ; x, 5, 8 ; xviii, 11, 5).

Divination by the flight of birds was certainly a most ancient practice, and as native to the indigenous inhabitants of the country as to the invading hordes of Northmen that descended upon the attractive southern plains about fourteen centuries before our era. There seems to have been but little or no trace of the custom in the Shemitic nations, among the peoples of Asia Minor, or along the Southern Mediterranean coasts.

Generally the large, predatory birds, whose solitary habits gave them individuality, were the subject of observation. The bird that was οἶος became οἰωνός. The derivation is akin to νίωνός from νιός, and κοινωνός from

κοινός. Their flight, their swift turns, are easily noted: their cries are distinguishable; their soaring into the blue sky took them to those heights where they might be the comrades of the gods. A flock of starlings has but little to say to the man of poetry, or to the man of superstition.

Zeus claimed to be monarch over the birds.

> Ζεῦ πάτερ, Ἴδηθεν μεδέων, κύδιστε μέγιστε,
> δός μ' ἐς Ἀχιλλῆος φίλον ἐλθεῖν ἠδ' ἐλεεινόν,
> πέμψον δ' οἰωνὸν . . . *Il.* xxiv. 308.

Apollo had the κόραξ, which, being more common, afforded more frequent opportunities for observation, and a class of specialist seers, κορακομάντεις, was devoted solely to its study. Apollo had the κίρκος also,

> ὣς ἄρα οἱ εἰπόντι ἐπέπτατο δεξιὸς ὄρνις,
> κίρκος, Ἀπόλλωνος ταχὺς ἄγγελος. *Od.* xv, 525-6.

and at one time the κορώνη, which was associated with Here as well (Apoll. *Rhod.* iii, 930), and with Athene (Ovid. *Metam.* ii, 548). Other birds of omen were the graceful heron, the messenger of Athene,

> τοῖσι δὲ δεξιὸν ἦκεν ἐρωδιὸν ἐγγὺς ὁδοῖο
> Παλλὰς Ἀθηναίη. *Il.* x, 274-5.

the owl, γλαῦξ, the rail, κρέξ, the wren, τροχίλος, βασιλίσκος, and the woodpecker, δρυοκολάπτης.

The interpretation of the omens was necessarily fanciful and subjective, and must have demanded no small amount of self-confidence, even in the sincere augur who did not smile at his own art, to trace a resemblance between the flight of a bird, its rending of its prey, and human affairs. The question was vital: who were the eagles, and who was the hare they were feasting upon? Who was the hawk, and who was the pigeon it was rending with its talons?

Telemachos sees the struggle in the air, but Theoklumenos, the seer, alone is able to tell its significance:

> ἔγνων γάρ μιν ἐσάντα ἰδὼν οἰωνὸν ἐόντα.
> *Od.* xv, 532.

There was nothing in the visible sign to indicate that the hawk was the symbol of Telemachos and not of Eurymachos.

The whole of the Greek army could see the two eagles :

> φανέντες ἴκταρ μελάθρων, χερὸς ἐκ δοριπάλτου,
> παμπρέπτοις ἐν ἕδραισι.
>
> *Agam.* 116–7.

Kalchas, the seer, alone is able to read the meaning. Xenophon and all his troops can see the eagle in the sky, but it is only the professional expounder of portents that can declare from it that Xenophon is to be the leader. The parable of the bird is too vague, too elusive for the ordinary mind : all it can understand is a haunting hope or fear.

> ὄρνιν δ' ἰδών τιν' οὐκ ἐν αἰσίοις ἕδραις,
> ἔγνων πόνον τιν' ἐς δόμους πεπτωκότα.
>
> *H. Furens,* 596-7.

The voice out of the unknown is heard, but it speaks an ambiguous language : an interpreter is needed, and he comes in answer to the human need. Instead of interpreting the laws of righteousness and the eternal verities, he expounds fanciful analogies and propounds conventions of his own inventing. So yet again Greece lost her way when she began to look upward to the heavens.

The lordly birds shared their ministries with some of the lesser birds, amongst whom was the woodpecker, once the holder of honours beyond them all.

Suidas has preserved the tradition that there had once been an inscription in the island of Crete :

> ἐνθάδε κεῖται θανὼν Πῆκος ὁ καὶ Ζεύς. (s.v. Πῆκος.)

Who Pekos was we may learn from a certain other Picus, of whom we have a tradition. Along the shore of the Adriatic is a land known to the ancients as Picenum, which was colonized by the people who were led thither by a woodpecker—picus. For that benevolence they worshipped the image of a woodpecker standing upon a pillar ; they call their new land Woodpeckerland in honour of him, and they themselves become the Wood-

pecker People. Later picus, the bird, becomes Picus, the famous king who governed the ancestral settlement, and a genealogy is provided for him. Yet his associations with the bird cannot be forgotten: by a goddess, who loved him too well, he is transformed back again into picus, the bird.

Pekos of Crete is the Picus of Latium; the kindred peoples who dwelt in the two lands had kindred beliefs. Pekos is Picus, the bird-man, the woodpecker king. The bird with its brilliant red head is the bird of the thunder, or the agent of the κῆρ of the thunder: Zeus is the god of the thunder; he has entered into possession of the thunder-bird's power and of the thunder-κῆρ, hence:

Πῆκος, ὁ καὶ Ζεύς.

To make that identity, and to say that the Lord of Olympus was mortal, and that a grave held him, was blasphemy to the religious Greek. It was for this reason that he held the Cretans were liars above all men, for they had promulgated a profane lie about the greatest of the gods.

Κρῆτες, ἀεὶ ψεῦσται, κακὰ θηρία, γαστέρες ἀργαί.

Blame the Cretans as they might, the Greeks themselves were the inheritors of the same belief, which had not completely passed out of their recollection. When Aristophanes creates the New Atlantis of the birds, which is to intercept the supplies of the gods from human altars, he makes the birds talk of recovering their lordship from Zeus, which was theirs in a bygone age. Then not Zeus, but Woodpecker, Δρυοκολάπτης, was king.

ΕΥ. οὐκ ἀποδώσει ταχέως ὁ Ζεὺς τὸ σκῆπτρον τῷ δρυκολάπτῃ.
ΠΕ. ὡς οὐχὶ θεοὶ τοίνυν ἦρχον τῶν ἀνθρώπων τὸ παλαιὸν,
ἀλλ' ὄρνιθες, κἀβασίλευον, πόλλ' ἐστὶ τεκμήρια τούτων.
Aves, 480–2.

The Cretan story is there: the Woodpecker is Zeus; the functions of the one are the functions of the other; the κῆρ of fire and thunder, as the flaming head of his bird proves him, is the fire-god and the thunder-god. Aristophanes can say that without being hooted at,

because he is saying it amidst roars of laughter, but to say it in an inscription on a tomb, which people are invited to visit as a sacred spot, is a very different matter.

A Cretan story enables us to see the struggle between the κῆρ-bird and the invader, and the final victory for the Olympian. Zeus was born in a cave within the island, where his swaddling clothes could for a long time be seen. From the moment of his birth he brandishes the thunderbolt. One day a certain Κελεός, which we can write κελεός if we choose, fully armed for battle, came into the cave with his companions, and Zeus hurled his bolts against them. Had not the Fates intervened he would have destroyed them all; but as the cave was a sacred place there could be no killing in it. The dispute was settled by turning Κελεός into κελεός, which he has been ever since.

The κελεός is the green woodpecker, but he had the woodpecker prerogatives, and is thunder-κῆρ, so is Zeus: the one is the other, but Zeus finally is the holder of the thunderbolt.

Our own ancestors held the same kind of belief about the bird, and paid similar honours to it. Yockleton (yockle, a West Country name for the woodpecker), Spetchley (German specht, woodpecker), Woodhatch (hatch is the same as hack), and not a few others, are names of both places and persons. They are the equivalent of Picenum and Picus, Κελεοί the town, and Κελεός the king.

When the word picus comes into our speech the process is repeated. Picton, Pickering, Peckham, Peckforton (Italian picoverde; French pic-vert) are the woodpecker places, and all of the family of Peek, Peck, Pick, Peak are those who were once woodpecker men, to whom he was fire-god; hence supreme benefactor, companion in trouble, and guardian in perilous places.

The bird was held in honour by a people in an island in the Mediterranean, on the shores of the Adriatic, and in our own coasts remote from those because the tradition of all those people had sprung from a common source. He conveys omens from Zeus to the later dwellers

in Greece, because he was once an exalted κῆρ, giving his own warnings and leading his own people. He was abased to attendant and servant, but the memory of his lost estate was never obliterated completely. Like blinded, enslaved Samson, he asserts his ancient power in the presence of his captors.

Divination by consulting the entrails of sacrifices, prevalent enough in later Greece, had no place in the earliest stages of its religious development. Plato could discourse upon the liver of the victim as a mirror where the divine thought was reflected (*Tim.* 71, C.), but even in Homeric times there was no exploration of the bodily organs of the sacrifice in search of omens. The θυοσκόος [σκοπεῖν] directed his observation to the character of the flame, and of the ascending smoke of the sacrifice, to learn whether the accompanying supplications were accepted. Though Hesychius held another view:

θυοσκόος.—εἶδος μάντεως διὰ σπλάγχνων τὸ μέλλον δηλοῦντος· οἱ δὲ τὸν δι' ἐμπύρων ἱερῶν τὰ σημαινόμενα νοοῦντα,

he is interpreting the word by the later practice.

The custom of inspecting the entrails for indications of the future was an importation from the East earlier than the year 600 B.C. When it had become current high authority was needed, and consequently invented, to explain its popularity and to bring it into more intimate association with the national life. It was ascribed to Poseidon, to Prometheus, to Orpheus; but the evidence of Homer had first to be ignored.

The acceptance of this foreign custom is indicative both of the better and the baser features of Greek religion. It reveals the longing of the soul of the people for communion with their unseen and inaccessible deities. Communion with them was a spiritual necessity, and every path that offered a nearer approach to them was trodden by the feet of eager worshippers. They were always ready to set up an altar

ἀγνώστῳ θεῷ.

The wild revels and dancing Mænads that accompanied the rites of the foreign Dionysos and the austere

severities of the Christian faith were both alike accepted, because they promised to lead the devotee into communion with his god.

The orgies of the stranger god were as repugnant as the idea of a crucified god :

Χριστὸν ἐσταυρωμένον, . . . Ἕλλησι δὲ μωρίαν.

There was enough in the drama of the *Bacchæ* to lead a Christian imitator to rewrite it as a *Christus Patiens*, with Christ in the place of the ancient god. St. Paul declared that he was offering what the race of his readers at Corinth had sought after in many ways and around many altars.

Ἕλλησι Χριστὸν θεοῦ δύναμιν καὶ θεοῦ σοφίαν.
1 Cor. i. 23-4.

The capacity to seek and to accept new aspects of religious faith, in spite of repugnant features associated with them, enabled the Greek to receive the message brought to him by a despised Jew. He was the first to welcome Christianity. Its home was in Greek households and Greek cities. Greek sympathies and emotions first vibrated in response to its appeals : Greek courage, Greek obedience, and Greek suffering were among the first illustrations of its teachings. It was in Greek speech, and modified by Greek thought, that its messages were proclaimed to the world. Had not the new faith won over the Greek mind it would have been confined to the narrow borders of the people whence it had sprung, and would never have held its sceptre over both the Eastern and Western world, the Old and the New.

In a subsequent age the lofty genius of Athanasius and the fiery imagination of Chrysostom helped greatly the Christian faith in its victorious progress through the civilized world ; but they did not do more than the unknown men who first gave it welcome into Greek soil. That welcome was a possibility, because it expressed an attitude of mind, a seeking of the soul, inherited through unnumbered generations. The reverse process, that the Jew should welcome the Theogony of the Hellenic race, or of any people, that Zeus should achieve in Palestine

what he achieved on the islands and mainland of Greece, is unthinkable.

Every mental quality has attached to it some inalienable weaknesses. The Greek mind adopted the new without expelling the incompatible old. Olympus is grafted upon the ancient, indigenous stock, but the old branches continued to put forth their blossoms side by side with the new growth.

In the struggle neither side was completely victorious. The Olympians got honours and worship paid to their names, but they had to accept the partnership of many of the Under World gods, with their repulsive symbols. The autochthonous deities were expelled from their gloomy thrones, but their rites survived under the shadow of the new temples. The religious phrases upon the lips of the worshipper were the words recently learned, but the thoughts in his heart and the action of his hands were those he had inherited from immemorial forefathers.

A somewhat similar thing happened when Christianity came to Greece. In the conflict the new faith won its victory, but at the cost of receiving into its bosom customs associated with the gods, whose altars it broke down and whose temples it occupied. The people were unequal to the task of expelling the old leaven.

To-day in Greece a thousand superstitions and folk-customs, connected with the Church and sanctioned by it, proclaim that the undying paganism still survives. The calendar of the Church's saints, who have appointed to them their special days for worship, is reminiscent of the ages long before St. Paul was heard at Athens. St. Dionysius has changed his name by a single letter, but he is still the giver of wine. St. Demetrius has changed his sex, but he is the saint of the peasant and his day is a popular one for marriages. St. Artemidos has made a similar change, but he has all the functions of Artemis: *παιδοτρόφος, κουροτρόφος, φιλομεῖραξ*. St. Elias, whose shrines are upon many a lofty hill, is the Christian successor to *ὁ Ἥλιος*, whose altars once possessed those hills, and he rides in his predecessor's gleaming chariot.

A frankly pagan and anthropomorphic conception of

God prevails almost everywhere, and in many respects the almighty God of Christendom is indistinguishable from Zeus.

θεὸς . . . δύναται γὰρ ἅπαντα.

Od. xiv. 445.

Ὑε δ' ἄρα Ζεύς, said the ancient poet; βρέκει ὁ Θεός, says the peasant to-day. In vain did the early fathers of the Church protest against the surviving customs; they were but crying to the winds. The people could not, and would not, surrender their old inheritance. A modern writer says:

"The common folk indeed profess and call themselves Christians: their priesthood is a Christian priesthood; their places of worship are Christian churches; they make the sign of the cross at every turn; and the names of God and Christ and the Virgin are their commonest ejaculations. But with all this external Christianity they are as pagan and as polytheistic in their hearts as were ever their ancestors. By their acceptance of Christianity they have increased, rather than diminished, the number of their gods; in their conception of them, and attitude towards them, they have made little advance since the Homeric age; and practically all the religious customs most characteristic of the ancient paganism, such as sacrifice, the taking of auspices, and the consultation of oracles, continue with or without the sanction of the Church down to the present day." (Lawson, *Modern Greek Folklore*, p. 47.)

A further defect of the Greek mind was its inherent inability to emancipate itself from material conceptions in its religious life. In philosophy it could move freely amidst the most brilliant and difficult abstractions; in religion it could hardly breathe the atmosphere of the spiritual, though desiring it. It sought after visible forms and objects that could be felt. A god unseen above the altar, more remote than man could measure, and perhaps unobservant of the prostration of his devotees, had but an indefinite hold upon the mind. The sacrifices were a visible reality: they were sacred at least, and perchance

had some indications from the gods upon them. The mind that sought the gods and desired to know their will turned aside to investigate spots on the bladebone of a sacrificed sheep or the convolutions of its liver; then, having done such things, it directed its ingenuity towards justifying itself.

More than once it seeks almost convulsively to emancipate itself, but the wings of the soul were too feeble to raise the feet of clay from the earth. Never did the break with the past approach completeness. In each successive stage towards a more spiritual faith it carried with itself time-worn burdens, that finally became too much for the supremacy of the new life. A lamp and sundry other articles were interred with the ashes of the Greek dead. With the Greek religion it was as though the instruments of its former material existence laid with it in the tomb were too much for it, and instead of being able to employ them in its new sphere it was dominated by them, and under their influence it was held back in the world it was endeavouring to leave.

The universal instinct of mankind to supplicate the gods was shared by the Greek. He could neither suppress an emotion so strong and so natural, nor could he allow it to attain its full spiritual expression. As soon as we see him as a substantial figure stepping out of the twilight of the dawn, we see him stretching up his hands in prayer. But his gods were too much like himself, or even less than himself. Like his neighbours, they had their price. He could not approach them empty handed. His prayer became frankly commercial: the currency was his sacrifices. The magnitude of the offering had to be proportioned to the request. A poor man could not expect great things from a god, if he could do more than kiss his hand. If the petition be for a kingdom, a hecatomb must be offered to win a hearing. Yet there must be plenty of things the gods can give in return for a garland or a piece of incense (Lucian, *de Sacrif.*, 12).

The custom had not changed much since the days of Homer. The savour of fat sacrifices secure the favour of the gods.

στρεπτοὶ δέ τε καὶ θεοὶ αὐτοί,
τῶνπερ καὶ μείζων ἀρετὴ τιμή τε βίη τε.
καὶ μὲν τοὺς θυέεσσι καὶ εὐχωλῇς ἀγανῇσιν
λοιβῇ τε κνίσῃ τε παρατρωπῶσ' ἄνθρωποι
λισσόμενοι, ὅτε κέν τις ὑπερβήῃ καὶ ἁμάρτῃ.

Il. ix. 497-501.

So spake the old man Phoinix.

The medium of exchange was the flesh of rams or of oxen ; in Greece to-day it is candles. The substitution is almost the only change that Christianity has wrought in the matter. The commerce between men and heaven is still on a system of barter. It is the expression of the racial character. Its roots are deep, and they were firmly embedded in the soil long before the days of Homer or of the heroes of whose prowess he wrote. Phoinix was the son of a long ancestry : he was speaking the language of distant forefathers, and his children after a hundred generations have not been able to unlearn it.

Chapter VIII. The Invasion of the Olympians

RITUAL is ever more ancient than theology: the one is conservative, the other is opportunist. The rite is crystallized by usage; the interpretation changes with the mental development of the worshipper. He outgrows his own gods: he has to create new interpretations of his deity. The god whose awful presence was in one age enshrined in an ark of shittim wood becomes later the omnipotent creator of the ends of the earth, whom the heaven of heavens cannot contain. Yet the ancient forms continue: the high-priest discharged the same functions, he would have declared, as Aaron did in the wilderness of Sinai; the same sacrifices were offered, and the same festivals were observed. The name of the deity changed: he was Elohim, Jahveh, even Baal the King, and Melek the King. But ritual abides. The apparatus may be more magnificent; the wilderness tent becomes the habitation of Shiloh, and then the temple of sumptuous splendour at Jerusalem; but the rites of the one are the rites of the other till the day they cease to be.

The ritual and the deity to whom it is offered become a repugnant contradiction, as the later prophets of Jahveh were declaring, but the people went their round, trampling the courts of the Lord, as did their forefathers; yet it was not sacrifice that their god required of them. It needed nothing less than the catastrophe of the destruction of the capital city, and the expulsion of the people from the centre of their religious life, to make the severance with the ritual customs of the past, and even then it was far from complete.

Such is the religious history of a people everywhere, and such is its course in the Greek islands and mainland about the same time that the Jew was achieving the same thing not many miles away across the waters of the Mediterranean.

The ritual forms of Greek religion are those primal origins, which express themselves as soon as man is conscious of forces outside himself. The gods of poetry and art are the creations of theology, the outcome of the needs of man for a humanized and more intelligible deity, whom he can describe in the only language he knows,

the language of his own experience; who is above himself, yet like himself.

There are two ways by which a people reaches this higher stage of religious belief: one is by the evolution of its own conceptions, and the other by the incursion of an alien system.

There are but few traces of the former in the primitive religious customs of Greece. The opportunity, apparently, never came to them. They solidified into permanence, hence our ability to trace them back from the Hellenic age into the mists of the Pelasgic. The later features and the primitive were antagonistic: every shrine, every altar, every grove, every hill, was the battlefield of hostile cults where battles were fought, as it were, by invisible armies in the air, but whose victories were recorded upon earth. The change from old to new came through victory and defeat, and not by evolutionary progress.

This form of religious subjugation comes whenever men travel, whatever may be their immediate object. Religion accompanies the merchant with his merchandise, the soldier in his expeditions, and the colonist in his migrations. It is the most frequent form of barter, because it touches vital interests. A man with a message about strange gods received a ready hearing, though it might end in derision. Men believed in their own gods, but others also were potent. The invisible realms were like the visible; authority was divided, divine sceptres had their frontiers. Many strange emergencies arise in life: if one god help not, perhaps another will, being rightly invoked. He might even welcome a new subject. It is well to know his name and the forms wherewith to address him. Religion is the domain of the greatest conservatism, and at the same time of the greatest latitude.

The East has influenced the West, and the West the East. A state of stable equilibrium has probably never existed even unto this day, nor does the stream flow constantly in one direction. It has its tides, even tidal waves. The salt waters of the ocean ascend the rivers, and then

the waters that have gathered far up the inland regions descend into the sea.

The forces of commerce, conquest, and migration were operating round the seaboard of the Mediterranean, and the mental forces were powerful in the agile, intellectual race like the one from which the Hellenic people sprung.

The sea was the common highway of the peoples, perilous, but once ventured not difficult. Readily did the Hellenes assimilate the religious forms brought to them through their harbours. Another highway was over the mountains in the north ; and though less came by that route, what came was momentous, for it was over those hills that the Olympians came to Greece.

The ancient Achaioi, a tribe of predatory Northmen, descended upon the plains of Greece about fourteen centuries before the Christian era, and brought Zeus with them.

His name discloses his birthplace. Zeus is the Indo-Germanic Djeus, The Gleaming One. He is the first of all the shining heavens, where the bright things are, the sun, the moon, and the stars ; whence comes the lightning, and where the day is born. He changes from the Sky to the Sky-god with the needs of his worshippers. Humanity cannot continue indefinitely to pay the homage of its adoration to material forces to which it cannot ascribe the attributes of a living being.

The rain and the thunder may be summoned from the heavens by mimetic rites, but why the sacrifice if the one who is Sky cannot see it ? If a man can sometimes summon the thunder and bring the rain, there must be a mighty medicine man who can make them both at his will, as everyone can see. *Ζεὺς ὕει, Ζεὺς βροντᾷ* : the Sky rains, the Sky thunders, becomes Zeus rains, Zeus thunders. He holds the rain and pours it out, just as the man does who imitates him by pouring out water at the fertility rites ; he holds the thunderbolt and flings its rumbling noise, just as the medicine man imitates it with his bull-roarer. *Ζεὺς αἰθριος*, meaning Zeus is the Aither, becomes Zeus who dwells in the aither, unto

whom a certain Themistokles, son of Menander, set up the altar :

ΘΕΜΙΣΤΟΚΛΗΣ
ΜΕΝΑΝΔΡΟΥ
ΑΙΘΡΙΩΙ ΔΙΙ
ΕΥΧΗΝ

In a fragment of Euripides from an uncertain play one of the characters says :

ἀλλ' αἰθὴρ τίκτει σε, κόρα,
Ζεὺς ὃς ἀνθρώποισιν ὀνομάζεται ·

and in another he is

ἄπειρον αἰθέρα . . . Ζῆνα.

Deities do not shake themselves free from their primitive attributes : they are accompanied by them, almost haunted by them, like Zeus by the eagle, the assessor upon his throne. Nor do men emancipate themselves entirely from the past out of which they have emerged. They are like travellers who, having passed through a thicket dense and gloomy, carry with them, cleaving to their garments to the end of the day, fragments out of the undergrowth. Zeus was once the brightness which is day : it cleaves to the speech of men and to the skirts of the god. " Cretenses Δία τὴν ἡμέραν vocant " (*Macrob. Sat.* i, 15, 14) and ἔνδιος continues to be " midday." He was once the sky : centuries later a worshipper carves a hymn to him on stone, and calls him

Κρόνιε, παγκρατὲς γάνος.

The satyrs in the play, when told

βλέπετ' ἄνω, καὶ μὴ κάτω,

make the reply :

ἰδού, πρὸς αὐτὸν τὸν Δί' ἀνακεκύφαμεν,
καὶ τἄστρα καὶ τὸν Ὠρίωνα δέρκομαι.

Cyclops, 212-13.

The heavens are Zeus himself. The satyrs and the Cyclops are creatures of an age long gone, and they appropriately speak its language ; but the poet and the audience have not forgotten that it was once the speech of men.

When the artist begins to give visible representation to the god he paints a blue nimbus about his head and a blue globe under his feet. He is the sky, and at the same time its lord. It is part of himself in the highest part of his being : it is also under his feet. In the development that came in later ages he who had been the great despoiler of his rivals encountered a Deity, and was himself despoiled of these symbols of his majesty. The artists of the Christian Church transferred them to their representations of the Almighty.

The god of the gleaming sky touches the earth upon the peaks of the gleaming mountains, where most of the events take place that are associated with his world dominion. He descends there, not merely because they are the loftiest points of the earth, but because they are the brightest at dawn and sunset and noon. No spot in this world is so radiant as a snow mountain : it glistens more brilliantly than the glistening sun above it, and twice a day, under the rising and departing beams of the sun, it is the most resplendent patch of light in the heavens above or on the earth below.

The mountains merge into the heavens so as to become part of them. Snowy Olympus is heaven.

οἳ Ὄλυμπον ἀγάννιφον ἀμφινέμονται. *Il.* xviii. 186.

It is a matter of surprise to those who do not know them that the substantial solidity of their bases, their adamantine buttresses, and all those elements that combine to make them the most massive objects known to man, become at their peaks as ethereal as gossamer clouds. The mountains of the Bernese Oberland look like banks of fleecy clouds when seen in the afternoon light from the terrace of Berne Cathedral. Above many an English landscape there may be seen clouds that are Alpine ranges beheld from some distant height.

No one could say where the αἰθήρ ended and the earth began. The crests of the mountains belonged to it, for they reared themselves above the clouds that girdled them. No man knew how high they were, for none had ever set foot on them. Mountain climbing is a singularly modern

enterprise. It was as late as the eighteenth century that the first snow peak of Switzerland was scaled, and then not by a native. It was the Titlis, a small mountain of but 10,600 feet, which can be ascended in about six hours without peril or effort from the village in the valley. Natural features do not change; they are the same to-day as two thousand years ago, and the man who faced Cæsar's legions when they went against the Helvetii might have made his way to that height between a summer sunrise and noon. But he did not: it was an object of terror and awe to him. He was used to danger, hardship, and long hours of abstinence far beyond what he would have to endure during those few hours while ascending through the pines and then across the snow, like that he had round his hut every winter. Yet he dared not venture that unknown height. Its weird noises, its avalanches in spring, the rumbling of its falling stones, terrified him. It was as natural for the worshipper to locate his god of the sky on the tops of the high mountains, as it was for the god to select them as his habitation.

Zeus the Sky-god became Zeus of the mountains. It was over the mountains, and not over the sea, that he comes to Greece. He is the god from the north; and if one may hazard a guess as to his route, it was by way of the Danube to Dodona, where he leaves his northern wife, Dione, thence to Olympia, and there takes to himself Here, the native deity, by right of conquest. She was already there a native goddess, and was compelled to cede her matrilinear deity to the Father of gods and men, but her turbulent asperity, whenever she opens her lips, shows that the memory of her subjugation was never entirely forgotten: she is rebellious to the end.

As the tribe ascends along the valley its god accompanies it along the heights. When it abides, he does also, and his abiding-place is called Olympus. It is now easy to see why there is a score of mountains bearing the same name, besides the one that Homer knew. Each section of the migrations, as it broke away from the main stream, established the tribal god upon the loftiest peak of its neighbourhood, and called it by the name common to

them all. The mountains with the name are like signs set up marking the way the immigrants travelled. These northern Achaioi came by way of Thessaly into central Greece, across the Gulf of Corinth, and finally to Elis, where they found the god Kronos (*Paus.* v, 7, 4, 10). In the conflict that inevitably ensued Zeus was victor, and drove Kronos from his throne and seized his sceptre. Henceforth he reigns over gods and men, like the northern freebooter that he is. The Sanctuary becomes Olympia, belonging to the god of Olympus, and the games from that time forward took their name from the habitation of the god whose snowy, gleaming height looked down upon them.

Though Zeus is firmly established in Greece, which becomes his kingdom, he cannot sever himself from his former followers. Like discarded relations, they cling to his skirts, and they find him at Dodona, where by the lake he has one of his chief shrines.

These followers were the Hyperboreans. Their land was so far north that it was outside the range of terrestrial geography: it lay beyond the home of the north wind, whence their name. It was a land of longevity, felicity, and almost perpetual sunshine. Only once in the course of the year did the sun set. Imagination, having free scope in the realms of the unknown, portrayed it as heaven upon earth. A geographical fact and an historical fact had been fused together with the inventions of the imagination. Zeus had come from thence: it was his native land, and therefore must be like the Olympus that glittered in the skies of Greece, only more suitable to the god, and where the people were more greatly blessed.

Herodotus tells how the Hyperboreans sent offerings to Zeus at Dodona, and their fears when their embassies never returned show how they felt they were being coldly treated by their god. The significance of the story is clear. When part of the tribe migrated southward, taking its god with it, the remaining portion maintains its relationship with him. He is in both lands—the old and the new. He has both left his ancient seat and abides in it. His worshippers at his original home claim fellowship

with him in his new one. The migrant tribe would be ready enough to maintain the identity between the god it had brought into its new settlements with the god of the land it had left, till generations arose who forgot, or who wished to forget, that their god was anything but native to what had become their own country. Little cordiality would then be shown in the reception of offerings that contradicted their belief or their desire.

The conclusion is clear. The Hyperboreans did not send out of the unknown to the distant south because they had no gods of their own, or not enough, but because they were still cleaving to the god who was theirs before he made a far journey from them. Zeus is a Hyperborean.

Phoibos Apollo is almost the equal of great Zeus himself in the awe and splendour of his majesty as he moves amongst gods and men. He is the god of battles : mighty armies are vanquished in his presence ; when he enters Olympus, bearing his bow, all the gods start from their thrones in fear, except Zeus and Leto, his mother.

As Phoibos, The Gleaming One, the sun god, he is associated with Zeus, who is called his father, and like him he has connections with the north. The Hyperboreans who send embassies to Dodona send to Delos also, where he has established his shrine. A road leading into the north is sacred to him. The god himself had travelled that way when he moved into his new domain, and by it communications continued to pass between the new sanctuary and the old, till war or famine interrupted them, and men forgot that distant point in a land far off where the road had its origin. When Zeus migrated southward Phoibos either accompanied him or, what seems more likely, another section of the tribe transported him.

A dual name to a deity is almost invariably indicative of complexity in his composition. Conquest or assimilation has been at work. The Apollo half of the god presents many problems. Who he was before he associated with the other half we cannot at present tell, though some fortunate archæological discovery, or even the unobserved significance of some passage of our literature of Greece, may some day make it clear.

Some things about him that can be discovered point clearly enough to his northern origin, like that of the other half. His sacred trees betray him. It would seem as though he had endeavoured, after the manner of his kind, to sever himself from his old affinities, but they cling too tight for him. His sacred tree was the laurel—a shrub that has no place in a Hyperborean climate. It belongs to the more genial zones of Europe; consequently, if Apollo came from the north he could not have brought it with him.

The laurel, however, is not his first sacred tree. Ovid tells us about it. The most ancient myth connected with him is his slaying of the Python at Delphi, and that the Pythian games were instituted to perpetuate the notable achievement.

> Neve operis famam posset delere vetustas,
> Instituit sacros celebri certamine ludos,
> Pythia de domitae serpentis nomine dictos.
> His juvenum quicunque manu pedibusve rotave
> Vicerat, aesculeae capiebat frondis honorem.
> Nondum laurus erat, longo decentia crine
> Tempora cingebat de qualibet arbore Phoebus.
>
> *Metam.* i, 445–451.

Ovid is speculating about the association he found, or knew of, between Apollo and the oak, and makes a bad guess. A god does not acquire a sacred tree in such a casual manner. The fact he knows is that there was a time, even at Delphi, when the oak was Apollo's sacred tree, with which he "crowned his long and comely locks," and not with the laurel: "nondum laurus erat."

Though the particular species of oak, the *æsculus*, cannot be definitely identified, there is no reason to conclude it was a different kind from the one of whose acorns our own forefathers, the ancient Britons, made their meals, and for which peasants of Northern Europe too often in more recent times have been thankful under the stress of famine. The oak belongs to Europe, and not to either Asia or Africa, and its habitat extends to the furthest north. The Apollo half of the god descended from the cold north just as much as the other half.

There may have been a relationship between the two

halves. The oak, as may be shown, is the thunder-tree, and the sun-god has much in common with the thunder-god. Apollo sometimes hurls the thunderbolt. Pausanias says of Aristodemos that he died by a lightning stroke (iii, 1, 6). Apollodoros (ii, 173) says it was through an arrow of Apollo, and in another place he makes it clear that the arrow is the lightning :

Ἀπόλλων . . . τοξεύσας τῷ βέλει εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν κατήστραψεν.
i. 139.

Thunder and the sun are far apart in our thought, but that is the result of knowledge ; they were not always so. Bronte and Sterope were the two steeds of the sun.

Another of his sacred trees is the apple, which is probably associated with the oak by the link of the mistletoe, most commonly found in one of its forms upon the oak, and in another upon the apple-tree. Apollo has acquired some connection with the Golden Bough.

In the island of Rhodes there was a town called Ixiai, the Mistletoe Town, just as Appledore to-day is the Apple Town, and there Apollo was worshipped under the name of Ixios Apollo. He is Apollo of the Mistletoe, and would seem to have some relation to Ixion, the Mistletoe Man, who circles for evermore bound to his solar wheel. One gained entrance to Olympus ; the other missed it, and paid the penalty. Whatever the relationship may be, Apollo, with his mistletoe, declares that he has come from northern lands.

His apple-tree equally binds him to the north. On a Delphian coin inscribed ΠΥΘΙΑ there is a victor's table on which a pyramid of apples is unmistakably shown. A further testimony of the coins is from Eleutherina, in Crete. One represents Apollo bearing his bow in his left hand, and in his right a round object which has been regarded as a stone. Mr. A. B. Cook, from another coin in his possession from the same town on which Apollo is represented, is convinced that it is an apple. The evidence of the coins is further confirmed by a passage in Lucian's *Anacharsis*, in which Solon explains that prizes in the athletic contests are at the Olympia a wreath of wild olive,

at the Isthmia one of pine, at the Nemeia one of parsley, and at the Pythia some of the god's sacred apples (*Anach.* 9).

His association with the fruit is so close that there was an Ἀπόλλων Μαλοείς. The name appears in a scholion on a passage of Thucydides :

> Μάντω ἡ Τειρεσίου περὶ τοὺς τόπους χωρεύουσα τούτους μῆλον χρυσοῦν ἀπὸ τοῦ περιδεραίου ἀπώλεσεν· εὗξατο οὖν, εἰ εὕροι, ἱερὸν ἱδρύσειν τῷ θεῷ. εὑροῦσα δὲ τὸ μῆλον τὸ ἱερὸν ἱδρύσατο, καὶ Μαλοεὶς Ἀπόλλων ἐντεῦθεν παρ' αὐτοῖς ἐτιμᾶτο.

The story is inherently unlikely as an explanation of the name of the god, but there are some significant things about it. The damsel was wearing the golden apples before she lost one of them, and her name and parentage give the reason. She was a prophetess and the daughter of a prophet, a priestess and the daughter of a priest. The golden necklace was her badge, and symbolic of the god she served. Apollo was the apple-god before she had to weep over her loss.

Stephanos Byzantios refers to the incident, taking his information from the *Lesbika* of Hellanikos :

> Μαλλοείς·
> Ἀπόλλων ἐν Λέσβῳ· καὶ ὁ τόπος τοῦ ἱεροῦ Μαλλοεὶς, ἀπὸ τοῦ μήλου τῆς Μαντοῦς, ὡς Ἑλλανικὸς ἐν Λεσβικῶν πρώτῳ.

An inscription found at Epidaurus gives the same information in another way :

ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΙ
ΜΑΛΕΑΤΑΙ

In Silenus the inscription appears again :

ΤΩΙ ΜΑΛΕΑΤΑΙ

Μαλεάτης would almost certainly be allied to μαλοείς if the first syllable were long. Farnell, from some verses in Isyllos, comes to the conclusion that it is short, and therefore ascribes a geographical significance to the title. Its parentage, he says, is from Cape Malea, in the South of

Laconia, or from the place in Arcadia bearing the same name. The verses are :

οὐδέ κε Θεσσαλίας ἐν Τρίκκῃ πειραθείης
εἰς ἄδυτον καταβὰς Ἀσκληπίου, εἰ μὴ ἐφ' ἁγνοῦ
πρῶτον Ἀπόλλωνος βωμοῦ θύσαις Μαλεάτα.

The first line has a spondaic ending, and it would be legitimate to give the same kind of ending to the last line by synezesis of the ᾱα.

. . . βωμοῦ θύσαις Μᾱλεᾱτᾱ.

Isyllos knows nothing about the apple, only an eponymous Μᾶλος, who built the altar, but there is no doubt about the quantity of the vowel :

πρῶτος Μᾶλος ἔτευξεν Ἀπολλωνος Μαλεάτα | βωμόν.

Apollo is Μᾱλεάτης, god of the apple-tree, just as Dionysos, by one of his epithets, is συκίτης. The apple cleaves to him ; it claims him as its own, and is constantly reminding the rival laurel that it has a more ancient sanctity. It and the god came from the same country ; the laurel is a mere parasite and usurper.

The native land of the apple is the north. It maintains a vigorous life near the Arctic Circle in Norway and amidst the long winter snows of Siberia. The Greek swain would sometimes declare his love for his Xanthippe by casting an apple towards her. The northern home of Apollo sends its apple after him to declare the fidelity of its attachment to him.

Names have their message as well as their meaning, and perchance the name of this god may tell something, at any rate some day, of his geographical ancestry.

The form Ἀπόλλων is Ionic : in Dreros and Knossos it was Ἀπέλλων, in Thessaly Ἀπλοῦν, and in Cyprus Ἀπείλων, which must be for Ἀπέλϳων, and is possibly connected with the Macedonian month Ἀπελλαῖος, whose position in the calendar cannot be definitely fixed. It may be December or September or October. If it were the Apple Month it would not stand quite alone ; for Byzantium has one, Μαλοφόρος, corresponding to September-Octo-

ber. Other forms of the name of the god are in Oscan Apellun, and in Etruscan Aplu, Aplun, and Apulu.

These examples show that the " o " has displaced an older " e." The derivations from ἀπολύω, ἀπόλλυμι, or ἀπελαύνω, belong to the time when etymology was a Liberty Hall, where everyone did as he liked and made his own rules as he ambled along. Only one of the ancient guesses receives any recognition now. Macrobius says (*Sat.* i, 17, 14) :

> Ut Apollinem apellentem intellegas, quem Athenienses ἀλεξίκακον apellant.

Ἀπόλλων would thus be derived from a lost stem preserved in the Latin *pello*. The derivation is far-fetched, and can hardly be accurate. The privative " a " prefixed to the supposed stem would not make the equivalent to ἀλεξίκακος. Mr. Cook makes the interesting speculation that the name is to be traced to ἀπελλόν, which Hesychius defines as

> αἴγειρος, ὅ ἐστι εἶδος δένδρου.

The αἴγειρος was sacred to the god, but it was the oak before it became the poplar, inasmuch as *æsculus* = *æg-sculus*.

The association of Ἀπέλλων with the apple through Ἀπέλλων μαλοείς and Ἀπέλλων μαλεάτης suggests the possibility that the apple-tree has provided him with his name. The word apple is common to all the languages of Europe, from the Atlantic to the Siberian Steppes, from the Polar Ocean to the Alps. The philologist who some day may be able to tell the world where that word was spoken first will give not only an interesting piece of horticulture, but will possibly indicate where the radiant god of the Greeks stepped forth to receive the homage of generations.

The Latin speech has the merest trace of the word as a place-name. In Campania there was a town renowned for its abundant orchards :

> Et quos maliferae despectant moenia Abellae.
>
> *Aen.* vii. 740.

To-day it retains its fame and its name, Avella Vecchia. It was the Apple Town, like Appledore, of which there are two : one in Devon, and the other in equally fruitful Kent. Avalon, whither King Arthur was carried to dwell in the Isles of the Blest, was the Apple Land (Armoric Aval) " fair with orchard lawns."

There may be an indication of the use of the word as a place-name in Apulia. Did the first Greek settlers call their new country Apollo Land or Apple Land ? Did they think of their god, or of the welcome sight of the fertility before their eyes which was theirs for the taking ? The latter is the more likely. " When the children of Israel saw it, they said one to another : It is Manna, for they wist not what it was. And Moses said : This is the bread which the Lord of hosts hath given you to eat." Religion stands a poor chance of holding the first place in competition with the choice things that appeal to the eye.

Perhaps to those settlers it was both Apollo Land and Apple Land, for Apollo was certainly a god who had an orchard. Oreithyia, in the lost tragedy of Sophokles, is carried away by the north wind to the uttermost parts of the earth, the ocean, and of the heavens to the Garden of Apollo.

> *Σοφοκλῆς τραγωδεῖ περὶ τῆς Ὀρειθυίας, λέγων ὡς ἀναρπαγεῖσα ὑπὸ βορέου κομισθείη·*
> *ὑπέρ τε πόντον πάντ' ἐπ' ἔσχατα χθονὸς*
> *νυκτός τε πηγὰς οὐρανοῦ τ' ἀναπτυχὰς*
> *Φοίβου παλαιὸν κῆπον.* *Frag.* 655.

Apollo, the Lord of the Orchard, may well be the Apple God, and have apples made sacred by his associations awarded as prizes at his most noted festival. If his name declare that fact, then Ἀπόλλων *μαλοείς* and Ἀπόλλων *μαλεάτης* are merely doublets.

From the north he came, and from a region so far distant that to the ancient it was beyond the limits of terrestrial geography, beyond even where the north wind was born before it spread its boisterous wings over the world. Apollo was a northern god who came with it to Greece.

Athene, the third of the great Olympians, is manifestly a complex creation. She seems to have northern associations, for she is the daughter of Zeus; but reputed parentage among the gods is an uncertain foundation on which to build an hypothesis. Dionysos claims Zeus as his father, but he never came from the land of snows. Though there is this to be urged: Athene was reigning upon her throne long before Dionysos and his bacchanals came over the Thracian hills. So she may have made the journey with Zeus after all. It is clear that she comes from a patrilinear, and not from a matrilinear, stock. There is nothing of the Orient about her. The myth of her motherless birth from the head of Zeus is but an exaggerated statement of her alliance with a patriarchal and not a matriarchal state of society. She did not belong, either, to those matrilinear days of ancient Kronos, when the father was ignored. She repudiates, either in advance or in the progress of the controversy, all connection with them.

μήτηρ γὰρ οὔτις ἐστὶν ἥ μ' ἐγείνατο·
τὸ δ' ἄρσεν αἰνῶ πάντα, πλὴν γάμου τυχεῖν,
ἅπαντι θυμῷ, κάρτα δ' εἰμὶ τοῦ πατρός.

Eum. 736-8.

Apollo is loyal to her, though he cannot claim a birth as remarkable as hers. He says:

οὐκ ἔστι μήτηρ ἡ κεκλημένου τέκνου
τοκεύς, τροφὸς δὲ κύματος νεοσπόρου·
τίκτει δ' ὁ θρώσκων, ἡ δ' ἅπερ ξένῳ ξένη
ἔσωσεν ἔρνος, οἷσι μὴ βλάψῃ θεός.
τεκμήριον δὲ τοῦδέ σοι δείξω λόγου.
πατὴρ μὲν ἂν γένοιτ' ἄνευ μητρός. πέλας
μάρτυς πάρεστι παῖς Ὀλυμπίου Διὸς,
οὐδ' ἐν σκότοισι νηδύος τεθραμμένη.
ἀλλ' οἷον ἔρνος οὔτις ἂν τέκοι θεός.

Eum. 658-66.

Possibly his loyalty is a reminiscence of their kinship before either of them came to Athens.

If she came from the north she was greatly changed after her arrival. The original Achaian warriors could not

have invoked their maiden deity by the name Athene. Perhaps they called her Pallas, or something like it, for Παλλάς is related to πάλλαξ, as ὄρνις is to ὄρνιξ, and is enshrined in παλλακή, while the Latin *pellax* shows that somewhere in that country, as remote in distance as the period was in time, there was a word for " maid " as near to Παλλάς as Ζεύς is to Djeus.

When she came to Athens she became the maiden goddess of the city, bearing a shield and wielding the thunderbolt. The gods cannot possess their high thrones without a conflict any more than the kings of men. When they enter a new domain they find that other deities have been before them, who are as reluctant as men to surrender their sceptres. There are signs of the struggle that Pallas had to wage before she could become Athene. She had the customary battle, and Poseidon was her foe, whose trident marks him as being originally one of the many thunder gods. There cannot be two thunder patrons in the same city, and one had to depart. He migrates to the sea, and stirs the waves with his trident. All that is left of him on the land is a mark on the ground that his trident has made.

Perhaps there was a concurrent struggle amongst the men of the city as well, and the battle in the unseen is but a reflex of what was happening in the state. Poseidon was the patron of the Athenian knights, from whom they claimed descent. When young Demos arose the dethroning of the god of his opponents was one way of breaking their power. How could they claim authority in the city when their divine progenitor and defender was driven into the ocean ? Athene was exalted to the vacant throne, where she remained to guard all democracies, honoured by a temple that gave as great a renown to her as to the genius of its architects.

The rest of the Olympians are shadowy beings in comparison with this majestic Trinity—Ζεὺς τερπικέραυνος, Ἀπόλλων ἑκατηβόλος, and Ἀθήνη ἐρυσίπτολις. Though they assimilated many fresh qualities and attributes, they brought with them into Attica the determining elements of centuries of its religious life. The rest are subsidiary.

Unitedly all the gods and all the goddesses are unequal to the Lord of Olympus, to move him from his seat,

οὐδ' εἰ μάλα πόλλα κάμοιτε.

But he at the other end of the golden chain hung high in heaven could lift them all, together with earth and sea. Apollo and Athene seem to have had less fear of him and his deep hell with gates of iron and threshold of brass, but the rest were stricken with silence before his awe-inspiring threats. It was but a parable of what was happening in the towns of Greece: Zeus was the leader, the rest were but followers.

As he and his two chief assessors on Olympian thrones came from the north, it is of less importance to determine the origin of the others. A few words may suffice for those who attained not to the first three.

Here was the wife of Zeus, but not until after he had exercised his lordly privilege of deserting Dione, the shadow of his being and the bearer of his name (Δι-ώνη, Διός), whom he left at Dodona. When his conquering worshippers descended upon Thessaly he seems to have taken as his consort the queen goddess of his new domain, who was mistress there on her golden throne and in her own right. She belongs to the original Pelasgic matrilinear society, and resents the dominance of a husband. She represents, too, the subjugated people, and expresses their national resentment. Olympus was not made more harmonious by her presence. She talks like a vixen, even to her lord. He says to her:

ἦ μάλα δὴ κακότεχνος, ἀμήχανε, σὸς δόλος, Ἥρη,
Il. xv. 14.

and Poseidon, not without reason, calls her

Ἥρη ἀπτοεπές. *Il.* viii. 209.

Probably she was equally disliked by the conquering people. Nevertheless, she held her own. She refused to accept the name of her new lord. She retains her individuality, even if she lose her independence, and remains χρυσόθρονος to the end, which is more than Dione did. If she will acknowledge any name, it is that

of her quondam consort Ἡρα-κλῆς, who, in a state where the mother was supreme, had never been able to attain rank as her equal.

Demeter was another of the many spouses that Zeus took to himself, and who finally contributed to his own undoing. A god with a harem can hardly maintain his position when society becomes conscious that its morals need reform. She comes to the mainland from Crete, or through Crete, which by its position was the highway followed by the apostles of early religions, by the mariners, and possibly by the pirates too, in their voyages between Europe and Asia and Africa. Hesiod is sure that she came from Crete, where she had a human lover, Iasion.

> Δημήτηρ μὲν Πλοῦτον ἐγείνατο, δῖα θεάων,
> Ἰασίῳ ἥρωϊ μιγεῖσ' ἐρατῇ φιλότητι
> νειῷ ἔνι τριπόλῳ Κρήτης ἐν πίονι δήμῳ,
> ἐσθλόν, ὃς εἶσ' ἐπὶ γῆν τε καὶ εὐρέα νῶτα θαλάσσης
> πᾶσαν. *Theog.* 969-73.

The once generally recognized meaning of her name, that it came from Δᾶ, the equivalent of Γᾶ, now finds but little favour. The recent disposition is to assume that the ancient lexicographers knew more about the etymological significance of names than the moderns. The derivation suggested by the *Etymologicum Magnum* finds favour. Under Δηώ, a curtailed form of Δημήτηρ, it says :

> ἢ Δηώ, παρὰ τὰς δηάς· οὕτω γὰρ δηαὶ προσαγορεύονται ὑπὸ Κρητῶν αἱ κριθαί.

(The Greek equivalent for δηαί is ξειά, one of the coarser kinds of barley.)

The derivation is plausible, especially when taken in connection with the Cretan origin of the goddess. It defines her significance as the mother of fertility. Her gifts to the world are the same as she gives to her Triptolemos. He labours at the plough, she rewards him with corn. She is different from the great Olympians ; she is no warrior ; battles delight her not, nor the death of men. Instead of a spear in her right hand she holds ears of corn ; in the place of a shield upon her left arm she carries a sceptre. She moves amongst the harvest fields, where she

became the mother of Ploutos. Wealth, not thunder, is in her keeping, for the richest goldmine in ancient times, as well as in our own, was the top twelve inches of soil. The modern has overlooked that, but the ancient could never forget it.

She belongs to the peaceful village, and every husbandman who drives the crooked plough and the ambling oxen is her Triptolemos to receive her favours. The cradle of Ploutos is in every farmstead. Rightly does she carry a sceptre, for she is goddess indeed, δῖα θεάων to the man who, like Hesiod, belongs to the land.

Her advent symbolizes that the age of the great migrations, plundering expeditions, and the winning of food by the sack of cities has come to its close. Man must conquer his own land to live, not another's. The gods of war must share their honours. Man has to ask for bread, not victory, and his warrior deities know not how to give it when lands have to be tilled, not ravaged. The Mother of Corn takes her place amongst the gods, and men pray to her with sacrifices by the altar and with labour in the field.

It is thus possible to fix the period when Demeter assumed her throne in Greece. She did not come from beyond the north wind, but Homer knew her for true Olympian. She arrived during that age of silence after the prehistoric palaces of Troy, Crete, Thebes, Mycenæ, and Tirens had been made desolate, and the conquerors, if indeed they did conquer, found themselves lords of barren victories. Succeeding generations, taught by their inheritance of suffering, began to pay greater heed to the arts of peace : Demeter became their goddess.

The founder of the Attic state worked in the daily garments of the husbandman rather than in coat of mail : his instrument was the plough, and not the spear ; his chariot was the farm-wagon rather than the chariot of war ; his helpers were his oxen rather than " the chargers, fleet and immortal," of the battlefields. In such an age men felt that their Olympus was incomplete without a goddess of the farmlands, and Demeter, Mother of Plenty, joined the Olympian circle.

Chapter IX. The Gifts of the Olympians

THE Olympians, when they descended upon Greece, were like unto their worshippers, and meet to be worshipped by men whose might was their law. They were known by their weapons of death and by the terrors they could inflict. They brought something more : they had the power of emancipating themselves from their own past. They were able to do what the gods of the Ægean, the Hittite, and the Shemitic races, with but a single exception, could not do. They were able to redeem themselves from much grossness, advance into a loftier plane, and become worthy to receive the offerings of the human mind.

The highest genius of the artist could not adequately represent their majesty to the eye of the worshipper ; the creations of immortal architects were insufficient for their habitation. They represented the victory of the man over the brute, the Greek over the barbarian. By a mightier power than that they wielded at first they ruled the life of the most progressive people in its most progressive period. Then came their fall. Perfection was not theirs ; they, too, were but human symbols ; time touched their thrones, and they crumbled in decay ; and they themselves were thrust amongst the superstitions of a past age by those who lived under the shadow of their temples.

The first thing they achieved was the liberation of themselves from their animal attributes ; or, if it were not the first, it was the most critical. There is no future for an animal god except to be the god of force, lust, and rage : great things are possible to him if he can become humanized.

No people that is looking upward, and having visions of a loftier life, can worship a god who is an ox or a snake, or identified with one or the other. The only thing to be done with a golden calf that the people honour as divine is to bruise it to powder and mingle it with the drink of the worshippers ; otherwise the god will bruise their soul to powder. Moses in the wilderness was at the watershed of religion : he destroyed the beast and saved the spiritual.

There was some Moses in that period of Greek history

equally remote, but equally critical, who did the same thing for Zeus and Greece, and transfigured him from his snake and ox forms. The god was capable of receiving the transfiguration, but not entirely: his ancient attributes cast their shadow over him.

With the passing of the animal there began to disappear the lustful. Men will not allow it to be deprived of the sanctions of religion without a struggle. Public women at Jerusalem in the days of Isaiah frequented the gates of the temple dedicated to Him before whose throne cherubim and seraphim sang "Holy, holy, holy is the Lord God of hosts."

Too much, therefore, cannot be expected from the Greek, with a less spiritual tradition behind him. Yet much was done. The old rites were made less prominent: the obscene symbols were covered with a veil of mystical interpretation. The repulsive satyr, indecent in gesture and form, almost entirely beast from his neck downwards, whose figure it is scarce seemly to reproduce fully and accurately even in the interests of modern knowledge, has his periods of celebration limited to a few licensed revels and to the comic stage. Even then they suffered some decent modification. The satyrs in the *Cyclops* are not as abominable as the satyrs of the vase paintings. Pictorial art is always the last to part with such subjects.

In country districts, and in town as well, the festivals of fertility continue to be observed under the sign of the phallos, but its grossest elements are thrust into the rear. The symbol is in the cornucopia, but it diminishes, and the fruits of the earth fill a larger space.

Olympus is definitely shut against any who are too closely allied with the degrading aspects of fertility worship. Herakles, like Apollo, was the son of Zeus. His infancy, youth, and manhood were all alike crowned with marvels. He was the hero of heroes. His life was beneficent, so that the endeavour used to be made to identify him with the sun. The slaying of the Python was not a greater achievement than his slaying of the Nemæan lion, the Lernæan hydra, and the Centaurs. Yet Apollo is in Olympus, and Herakles is out. The gods join to

help him: Athene arms him with helmet and armour, Hermes gives him a sword, Poseidon a horse, Zeus, his father, a shield, Apollo bow and arrows, Hephaistos a golden cuirass. Yet with all their help, though he may gain unequalled victories upon earth and accomplish the impossible, he cannot enter the gates of Olympus. His drawback is fatal: he is too physical. Shakespeare coarsely expresses it:

> Like shaven Hercules in the smirched, worm-eaten tapestry, . . .
> Where his cod-piece seems as massy as his club.
>
> *Much Ado* iii. 3.

The surviving statues of the two deities display the difference. The interval is vast between the typical statue of Hercules in the Vatican, for instance, and the most exquisite statue of Apollo Sauroktonos by Praxiteles. The one is spiritual, intellectual; the other is muscle, virility. The flesh is too aggressively prominent. The myth concerning him and the fifty daughters of Thestios made Pausanias blush, and he suggests it must refer to another Herakles (ix, 27, 6). The story is illustrative of his functions; the phallos is too conspicuous in his cornucopia.

When the Greek mind began to feel as Pausanias did it tried to redeem him from such associations. Later myths described his ascent into Olympus, but he is in Hades for all that. Odysseus sees him there, an *εἴδωλον* just like the rest. But the poet is embarrassed at his own legend, and makes him to be in two places at the same time.

> τὸν δὲ μετ' εἰσενόησα βίην Ἡρακληείην,
> εἴδωλον· αὐτὸς δὲ μετ' ἀθανάτοισι θεοῖσιν
> τέρπεται ἐν θαλίῃς καὶ ἔχει καλλίσφυρον Ἥβην.
>
> *Od.* xi. 601-3.

His equipment, however, and his speech are quite as real as anything else in that lower world. The Olympians have turned him and all he represents into Hades, and his popularity, his great deeds, and his spectacular presence cannot get him out.

The Olympians in their ascent severed themselves from their earthly origin. They and the *γηγενεῖς* are

ceaseless enemies. The pictorial representations show why. The latter retain the marks of their beginnings. Their bodies are human to the waist; they are a superior order of beings, for they are winged; in countenance they do not differ from Zeus himself; but their bodies end in snakes. They have won wings for themselves for the possession of a heavenly kingdom, but have failed to emancipate themselves from the baser elements.

The Olympians were once no better. No early Amasis, the potter artist, would have given to the god a more beneficent or, within his capacity, a more divine expression, than his successor in the sixth century gives to the mere creatures of the earth when he decorates a black figured olpe with the slaying of the gorgon. Yet Zeus is slaying them with his bolts.

The man who has risen desires to obliterate the traces of his ascent: there is a natural enmity between him and the lowly members of his family. He feels the necessity of opposing those who, once his equals, he has converted into his inferiors. The same spirit operated in the Olympians; yet there was a higher quality with it. They had repudiated their earthly elements; their antagonism to them was the measure of their sincerity and of the completeness of their change.

What they once stood for is to be suppressed with their might: the creatures that still express it are πελώρια, mere monstrosities. The νεώτεροι θεοί suppress them, because they are really θεοί, but are not worthy of the rank they claim.

> νέοι γὰρ οἰακονόμοι
> κρατοῦσ' Ὀλύμπου· νεοχμοῖς δὲ δὴ νόμοις
> Ζεὺς ἀθέτως κρατύνει,
> τὰ πρὶν δὲ πελώρια νῦν ἀϊστοῖ. *Prom.* V. 148-51.

The snake was the emblem of fertility, both of the human family and of the earth. In the oldest votive sculptures it is the assessor of the god, sometimes his equal, sometimes alone as his visible impersonation. In its form the god was subject to birth, death, and a succession of rebirths. He had to become ἀθάνατος. When he became death-

less he had to surrender the earthly functions his emblem represented. They were not creditable, and in some aspects not even seemly. Zeus had to rise into higher realms, and those who could rose with him ; those who cannot must pay the penalty. He becomes the Lord of gods and men :

πατὴρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε,

and takes his seat upon a heavenly throne.

This was all for the good of religion. It began to be religious in a modern sense. Nature rites, sympathetic magic, sexual symbols, were not abolished, but they were less closely intermingled with the homage paid to the gods. Worship began to be. It was possible to pay the adoration of the mind to deities that were beginning to be spiritual. The upward journey was long, toilsome, and steep ; neither gods nor men would be able to complete it ; but their entry upon it made it possible for Plato, after the discipline and struggle of centuries, to come to Hellas.

The Olympians, by rising to a heavenly estate, brought to an end the worship of the dead. The θεοὶ οὐράνιοι, victors over Titans and Giants, were more powerful to hurt or to bless than the θεοὶ χθόνιοι, and all their subjects. It ceased to be necessary to placate the once dreaded ghosts : they were restrained by a mightier sceptre, bond to a stronger will. Their grim and cheerless oblations and sacrifices abide only in the remoter places to be practised by the ignorant.

The dutiful children of a murdered king in the days of the heroes may fitly invoke his ghostly aid in their task of vengeance upon their guilty mother and her confederate the adulterer. It was a feature characteristic of an archaic age. The reader of the *Iliad* had learned how Apollo, the Far Darter, and gleaming Athene, and the great Thunderer himself, helped their worshipper in battle, in the home, and on the sea. He, too, would place himself under their protection and leave the dead alone, neither soliciting their help nor dreading their wrath.

The gods, by ascending from the earth into higher

realms, made the distinction clear between god and man, between god and even the most powerful man. Man is not god, neither in life nor in death. It needed daring and strong humanity to make that denial; but when Olympus was inhabited by beings with divine attributes it became as blasphemy to confuse their honours with those offered even to mighty heroes.

The deified man, strangling the human mind at the same time that he degrades it, became an abhorrent contradiction. For half a score splendid generations the Greek soul lived in human freedom, till Alexander, a half-Greek, who in the swamps of barbarism had caught the contamination of savage beliefs from which Greece had purified herself, brought them back and forced again the yoke upon the mind. He proclaimed that he was a god; son of the divine snake; and he destroyed classical Greece.

Another contribution made by the Olympians to the life of Greece was that they brought the peoples more closely together in national unity.

It is almost impossible to discern what is the determining, gravitating force that causes a people, or peoples, to coalesce into the unity of a nation. A common history and inherited tradition, similarity of customs and forms of government, a corresponding stage of intellectual development, the identity of language, the pressure of political conditions, the same religious beliefs and observances, may each, or all, have their part. Yet there are notable instances where all appear to be present but artificial frontier lines are not obliterated. On the other hand, there are instances equally remarkable where none of these factors appears to be present in adequate force, yet strongly diverse peoples become a united nation.

Among the Hellenic peoples they were all at work in varying degree, but one of the most powerful was the bond of common religion. It was able to exercise its formative influence at that critical period when the lines of demarcation between tribe and tribe had been submerged by war, or confused by changing settlements. Tribal names were still current, but they were fast passing

into fictions. The unit became the community within its own defences, governed according to the exigencies of the times and the genius of the inhabitants.

At the centre were the altars to the gods from whom the worshipper claimed his origin. They were the emblem and proof of the life he had in common with all who met there. Paramount amongst them were the altars of Zeus, potent to gather unto themselves the honours of local deities. The stranger within the gates found a shrine dedicated to his own god, unto whom he could pay his votive offerings for a safe journey, and before whom he could address his familiar prayers. He did not stand alone. Around him were the people of the city unto which he had come. Though a stranger, he was one of them : he and they were spiritual kin. The city he had left and the city he had entered were under the same divine protection, and were one before the gaze of the all-ruling gods.

Ideas govern the world : such an idea is one of the most sovereign. More than any other it has moulded the world of Christendom. The common altar became the common bond. The Olympians were neither local nor tribal : they were cosmopolitan, and the cosmos was Hellas. They were Hellanioi, whose fame was the possesion of every Hellene, whose sceptre was over all Hellenes. The peoples became a kingdom through the throne of their Olympian king. There was no such thing as heresy in Greece.

Other elements co-operated to accomplish this result, but religion was undoubtedly the chief. What Greece and the world would have been without it is beyond conception. The only imaginable alternative is that the land would have fallen by fragments under the dominion of some conquering warrior, and the Achaioi would have been known merely as the tribes of Helvetia and Germania are known, by having their names inscribed upon the monuments of some earlier Cæsar.

The Olympians are now interred in the graveyard of abandoned superstitions and beliefs, but before they passed hence they conferred a blessing upon mankind which the world can with gratitude acknowledge.

Finally, the gods of Olympus brought a large measure of intellectual order into the religious life of the people of Greece. Men will endure many contradictions in their theology, and incompatibilities may stand side by side. The ark of Jahveh can stand in the temple of Dagon. But there are limits, and the narrower they are the better for the elevation of the mind. Disorder in the heavenly places makes disorder in the earthly. Because thought and action alike lack a fixed centre, the waters of life are navigated by all the stars instead of by the Pole Star. The Olympians did not reduce the theogony to a single unity, but they made it into a single constellation.

They were immensely superior to the nature forces they displaced, and in comparison merited their thrones. They had human qualities, even if they lacked some of those that are now called divine. They were not merely potencies to be dreaded, with whom man could hold no real communion—whose acts had no moral value, nor could man fathom their meaning. They were mind and reason and a rough form of justice, though all were scarred by human defects.

Man could pay homage to such beings without suffering degradation : his mental vision was directed upward instead of downward. The old pottery artist represented the unseen world as he believed it to be. It was a world of Gorgons, Titans, Giants, Satyrs, and innumerable multitudes of Keres. It was a realm of horror which no art could make horrible enough ; of battles surpassing in the magnitude of their terror all that were ever waged upon earth ; of indecent licence in passion and revel, loathsome as it was unendurable, as a code of life in this world.

The sculptor, though not far removed from him in point of time, had been born into a new life. He, too, represented the unseen world of his vision. It was the realm of Athene Promachos (Pheidias), in the majesty of the defence of her city ; of Apollo Kitharoedos (Scopas), in the rapture of music ; of Aphrodite (Praxiteles), though love be in her heart, yet modest and winning by her pure beauty ; of Herë (Polykleitos), though less

majestic in conception than the work of the sculptor's greatest rival, yet worthy to be the consort of the king of gods ; and finally of Zeus himself (Pheidias), enthroned, the lord of victory and of the air and of might, before which Dio Chrysostom, familiar with tribulations, declared man forgot his cares and his sorrows. " He who is heavy-laden in soul, who has experienced many misfortunes and sorrows in life, and from whom sweet sleep has fled—even he, I think, if he stood before this image, would forget all the calamities and troubles that befall human life."

The difference was not because the artist in marble and ivory was endowed with a more lofty genius than the artist in clay, nor because of the conventions of their respective arts. Pheidias, had he been a decorator of vases, would not have painted snake-haired women, nor hybrid monsters, nor fertility emblems. Had Amasis, he of the Gorgon vase, worked in marble, he could not have fashioned a god of supreme and regnant majesty. His eyes had never been filled with the vision of one. He was the child of those archaic times when intellectual disorder created intellectual ugliness which no art could remedy. He had not been born into the age when intellectual order created a beauty that no art was adequate to express.

Progress became possible to the mind, for it had looked upon ideals which by their loftiness were worthy to win its ambitions. Its life had been as a house of disordered lumber, amidst which it was unable to move ; haunted, moreover, by ghosts, goblins, and ogres, fear of whom sealed up some of the chambers where some of the most precious things were stored. It was transformed into a place of order and arrangement, so that the splendour of its proportions and the magnitude of its extent could be perceived.

It was not a coincidence that art and learning made their phenomenal advance with the transformation : it was the natural consequence. Long centuries later the ashes that seemed dead were stirred : they produced a similar result. Strange extravagances were associated with the Re-

vival of Learning in Italy. Jesus is a hero, God is Regnator Olympi and Pater Nimbipotens ; Proteus foretells the Incarnation to the river god of Jordan ; the Muses are invoked to sing the Advent song. Nevertheless, it was a renaissance : it was a new birth ; and the first pulsations of new life came when the corpse of the Middle Ages touched the buried Olympians.

Neither in Greece nor in Italy did they achieve a complete success. The renaissance had to move into a purely spiritual kingdom ; the Olympians in Greece failed to enter there. They advanced far towards a monotheism that might have been endowed with sublime features, but they were entangled with too many irregular connections, their earthborn progeny was too numerous, and the local gods they had conquered finally had their revenge and they bruised the heel of Zeus so that he could ascend no higher. He had made compromises with the snake and the bull and the rest : he could become Father of gods and men, but not in the glory of solitary and divinely omnipotent godhead.

In the course of this chapter the gods of Olympus have been described as though they were living beings leading onward the men who called upon their name, inspiring them with lofty ideals, and emancipating them from the thraldom of dark superstitions. The deficiencies of language impose such forms of expression. They had neither life nor being : they were the splendid creations of the Hellenic mind, greater than its art and its literature, which it laid at their feet. They were the visualized projections of its ideals and its hopes, and the aspirations of its soul. Their story is the story of its struggle out of darkness into light, from base to noble, and from the brutalizing to the humanizing.

The creation of the gods of Greece was a greater achievement than that wrought by any other race save one, and even the gift of that one was modified by Greek theology. When Paul spoke to Athens and Corinth he gave to them some of their own conceptions, enriched and purified. There were Greek stones in the foundations of Christianity for the Gentiles.

For long centuries the Hellenic mind accomplished the thing wherein Judaism failed: it spread, and wherever it went it set up a rampart against the more ignoble and brutish practices which men had associated with their religions. Many and obvious were its defects, but it made for manliness and was the champion of the freedom of the mind. It created men; it created great men; it created free men. The mightiest of its opponents, save one, fell before it. The world was, and is, its debtor to the end of time. "I am debtor both to Greeks and to the barbarians,"

Ἕλλησί τε καὶ βαρβάροις . . . ὀφειλέτης εἰμί,

said the man whose hand laid the axe at its roots.

Immortal honour is the right of the people who so enriched the world by its religious struggles. States that were succoured by its valour gave to it tablets and wreaths of gold, and set up monuments to its martial victories. Its succour to an enslaved world transcended such trivial offerings. The monument of its victory was the man it had emancipated.

Chapter X. The Poet as Theologian

I. HOMER

HOMER is not what he was once thought to be—the beginning of history; but he is, for us, the beginning of clear knowledge. Where he stands the light shines, though there is an occasional mirage; beyond is mist, where gods and men wander as distorted shadows. Origins can be discerned, but not their development; gods appear, but no eye can see at what point of time they definitely array themselves in the robes of majesty in which they appear when their outlines are more clearly perceptible. They have changed, and we know that the world must have changed with them.

The creative and poetic mind had been working before Homer sang of the councils of the gods and the battles of men. Men had been feeling their way towards order in heaven and on earth. Many pioneers must have contributed, each a little, placing a stone in the foundations or indicating a course for the extensions, but none accomplished a work great enough to carry his name. Apparently the poems of Homer stand alone, yet they could not have been without an ancestry. Great as they are, that would be to ascribe to the human mind greater powers than ever adorned it. Their towering height, their amplitude, their dazzling genius have withstood the erosions of time which have obliterated the memory of all the lesser heights of the mountain chain.

For long centuries Homer, whether an individual poet or several is not at present material, was regarded almost solely for his poetry. The Father of History had been telling men that he was more than that: he was the theologian of Greece.

> οὗτοι [Ἡσίοδος καὶ Ὅμηρος] δέ εἰσι οἱ ποιήσαντες θεογονίην Ἕλλησι, καὶ τοῖσι θεοῖσι τὰς ἐπωνυμίας δόντες, καὶ τιμάς τε καὶ τέχνας διελόντες, καὶ εἴδεα αὐτῶν σημήναντες.
>
> *Hdt.* ii. 53.

The making was a ποίησις, just as he "made"

Agamemnon and Achilleus. The king was there upon the stage of history, ruling his people and giving up his life, entangled in the tapestries of his own palace; and Achilleus, the warrior, turning the tide of battle. The poet gave them form and substance, clothed them with living deeds, and filled their lips with speech. He became their "creator," if the Greek mind could have formulated such a thought in its distinctness.

He did the same thing for the gods: he endowed them with life, and made them as real to men as Athene was to Hektor upon the plains of Troy or to Odysseus in his palace. He gave to each his station, and defined his sphere. Out of a host of local deities he fashioned a single, awe-inspiring Zeus; from a chaos of provincial cults he produced a single Apollo. Under his hands disorder became order; "the black, tartareous, cold, infernal dregs" began to pass away; the noise of conflicts ceased, and he established harmony in heaven.

The poet's work may, in some respects, be compared to the *Summa Theologiæ* of Thomas Aquinas, or to the *Institutes* of Calvin, except that it had something of the Hebrew Scriptures as well. Extravagant claims were made for the poems. What Caliph Omar asserted for the Koran, and Tertullian for the New Testament, that each respectively contained all that was necessary for man to know, enthusiasts asserted for the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*.

Their sacred character was treated as men like Origen treated the Old Testament. Everything was symbol and allegory. Nothing was too trivial to be the type of something higher. The fringe on the high priest's robe was as the teaching of a prophet. Metrodorus of Lampsacus interpreted Zeus as *νοῦς*, Athene as *τέχνη*, and Demeter, Dionysos, and Apollo were organs of the body. He was following in the steps of his master, Anaxagoras, who declared that the subject of the Homeric poems was *ἀρετή* and *δικαιοσύνη*. No one to-day would discern that as the meaning of the poems: they have ceased to be scripture, and have become literature; but we can imagine the magnitude of the creative genius that left so great an impression on the minds of succeeding

generations. Homer the theologian wears a crown no less splendid than the one the world, by universal consent, has given him as poet.

Had Homer the poet, or school of poets, been asked the question "What is a god?" he probably would not have been able to give a consistent answer. Who can? We only detect incompatibilities in the dogmas of others. Homer was not a metaphysician, but a poet. He was not writing in expectation of the feud between scientific thought and theology, nor answering in advance the destructive criticism of his verses by philosophers. When sought for, inconsistencies quickly appear, yet the reader, held under the wizardry of the poetry, may never observe them. A man may read the *Winter's Tale* without noticing that Shakespeare has given a sea-coast to Bohemia.

Homer's gods are superhuman, yet human; moral rulers of the world, yet not moral; supreme, yet subordinate to Fate; corporeal, yet incorporeal; omniscient, yet ignorant; omnipotent, yet limited in power; ideal, yet imperfect; gods, yet not divine; men, yet deities.

In many and notable respects they are advancing along the highway at the end of which is the throne of the infinite majesty of the divine, but they were never able to cast off the mire of the earlier stages of their journey, and they were therefore hindered from reaching the end.

For one thing, they were too many. Polytheism cannot endure the analysis of precise thinking. Its multitude of gods may hold their place as long as men's minds are kept in watertight compartments: when the separating bulkheads are broken down departmental deities cannot exist in the larger spaces. They destroy each other.

Olympus comes within sight of being a monotheistic empire. At times Zeus is supreme. He confers with his assessors, like a human monarch, but he is master of his own decisions, to which the rest must submit even if they like them not, and often they do not.

> ἀλλὰ μάλ' οὔ πως ἔστι Διὸς νόον αἰγιόχοιο
> οὔτε παρεξελθεῖν ἄλλον θεὸν οὔθ' ἁλιῶσαι.
>
> *Od.* v. 103-4.

Poseidon is great in power, and asserts for himself an equality with Zeus; nevertheless, at his command he ceases from the strife.

παυσάμενόν μιν ἄνωχθι μάχης ἠδὲ πτολέμοιο
ἔρχεσθαι μετὰ φῦλα θεῶν ἢ εἰς ἅλα δῖαν.

Il. xv. 160-1.

At other times Zeus finds that the gods are not so subservient: they challenge him, and they endeavour to thwart his most determined purposes. Herë may have arrogated to herself some special privileges, or Homer may have been thinking of the ways of human wives; but she was not alone. She wrought her spite upon Herakles, notwithstanding her lord. Severely was she punished, suspended on high with unbreakable golden chains about her hands and two anvils upon her feet. The other gods were indignant at the punishment, and tried to release her. They, too, were punished, but the effort could not have been made unless they thought there was a chance of success.

Behind Zeus is the mightier power of Fate, to which he must submit, even when it decrees the death of his son Sarpedon on the battlefield, the best beloved to him of all men.

ὤ μοι ἐγὼν, ὅτε μοι Σαρπηδόνα, φίλτατον ἀνδρῶν,
μοῖρ' ὑπὸ Πατρόκλοιο Μενοιτιάδαο δαμῆναι.

Il. xvi. 433-4.

His tears, falling like rain of blood upon the earth, may express his grief and honour his son, but they cannot avert the decree, which binds him even more strongly than he can bind the rest of the Olympians. Later the doctrine will take more definite form:

ἀνάγκᾳ δ' οὐδὲ θεοὶ μάχονται. *Sim.* vii. 20.

Fate is the one inevitability and invincibility: if it possessed personality it would be the supreme, omnipotent god. It is a mere abstraction; an effort, perhaps only partly conscious, towards a monotheistic unification. It is inexorable law, yet without a law-giver. The conception is at once concrete and shadowy: it is omnipotence issuing decrees upon men, yet endowed with neither

divinity nor individuality. In some instances it merges into Zeus himself, as the terms μοῖρα Διός, Διὸς αἶσα, show. Zeus was on the threshold of becoming the monotheistic god : a little more and he would have been Μοῖρα and Αἶσα, but the abstraction would not coalesce with his personality into one individuality. He had to carry too many human relationships with him.

There are but few traces in the poems of qualities that we now call spiritual. The word πνεῦμα ὁ θεός had not been spoken in any language of men's speech. The Hebrew prophets had been trying to speak it when they spoke of the Spirit of the Lord. The Deutero-Isaiah asked the question : " To whom, then, will ye liken God ? Or what likeness will ye compare unto Him ? " And the Creation Record, which is certainly prior to that time, describes the act of creation as the moving of the Spirit of God on the face of the deep. (LXX. πνεῦμα θεοῦ.)

No image could represent Jahveh to the Jew ; a lofty statue of a man could represent Zeus to the Greek. He remained where the Elohist writer of the second chapter of Genesis was when he could conceive of Jahveh-Elohim walking in the garden, in which he had placed man, and conversing with him in his own speech.

The Homeric poems only occasionally pass beyond that point, and sometimes do not attain it. The gods, for the most part, are magnified men : their qualities are such as the creators of early folklore stories ascribe to the unseen people of the glade that sometimes wrought wonderful deeds for distressed men and women. A grandeur saves them from being trivial. They are the creatures of the mind, and not of the fancy ; they respond to the needs of the soul, and thereby inspire religious veneration.

The gods are corporeal, and subject to the passions and needs which arise from the body. They need food and sleep. They drink nectar from the hand of Hebe.

> . . . μετὰ δέ σφισι πότνια Ἥβη
> νέκταρ ἐώνοχόει · τοὶ δὲ χρυσέοις δεπάεσσιν
> δειδέχατ' ἀλλήλους. *Il.* iv. 2-4.

When Herë visits Olympus she finds all the gods feasting

in the palace of Zeus : they rise from their seats to salute her with their cups :

> ἵκετο δ' αἰπὺν Ὄλυμπον, ὁμηγερέεσσι δ' ἐπῆλθεν
> ἀθανάτοισι θεοῖσι Διὸς δόμῳ· οἱ δὲ ἰδόντες
> πάντες ἀνήϊξαν καὶ δεικανόωντο δέπασσιν. *Il.* xv. 84-6.

Zeus and all the gods can leave Olympus and abandon the government of the world to itself while they go to visit their friends and banquet with them, though they feast not on the food of mortals :

> Ζεὺς γὰρ ἐς Ὠκεανὸν μετ' ἀμύμονας Αἰθιοπῆας
> χθιζὸς ἔβη κατὰ δαῖτα, θεοὶ δ' ἅμα πάντες ἕποντο.
> *Il.* i. 423-4.

> οὐ γὰρ σῖτον ἔδουσ', οὐ πίνουσ' αἴθοπα οἶνον,
> τοὔνεκ' ἀναίμονές εἰσι καὶ ἀθάνατοι καλέονται. *Il.* v. 341-1.

They need sleep, and the guileful Herë appeals to the god of sleep, whose sway is over the eyelids of the gods as well as of men :

> Ὕπνε, ἄναξ πάντων τε θεῶν πάντων τ' ἀνθρώπων, . . .
> κοίμησόν μοι Ζηνὸς ὑπ' ὀφρύσιν ὄσσε φαεινὼ,
> αὐτίκ' ἐπεί κεν ἐγὼ παραλέξομαι ἐν φιλότητι.
> *Il.* xiv. 233, 236-7

They have local habitations, Olympian counterparts of the palace of Agamemnon at Mykenai, wrought to please the senses :

> βῆ δ' ἴμεν ἐς θάλαμον, τόν οἱ φίλος υἱὸς ἔτευξεν,
> Ἥφαιστος, πυκινὰς δὲ θύρας σταθμοῖσιν ἐπῆρσεν
> κληῖδι κρυπτῇ, τὴν δ' οὐ θεὸς ἄλλος ἀνῷγεν.
> *Il.* xiv. 166-8.

Kypris is wounded by the shaft of Diomedes, and it is as effective against her as against any mortal. Blood is in her veins, such as the gods have, and she is pained by her wound as much as Odysseus is by his.

> . . . ῥέε δ' ἄμβροτον αἷμα θεοῖο,
> ἰχὼρ, οἷός πέρ τε ῥέει μακάρεσσι θεοῖσιν . . .
> ἡ δὲ μέγα ἰάχουσα ἀπὸ ἕο κάββαλεν υἱόν . . .
> . . . ἡ δ' ἀλύουσ' ἀπεβήσετο, τείρετο δ' αἰνῶς.
> *Il.* v. 339, 340, 343, 352.

Lust is as potent over gods as much as men. The subtle Herë, sister of any woman, opens her beguiling of Zeus with a reference that is quite human to Tethys and Okeanos :

τοὺς εἶμ' ὀψομένη, καί σφ' ἄκριτα νείκεα λύσω.
ἤδη γὰρ δηρὸν χρόνον ἀλλήλων ἀπέχονται
εὐνῆς καὶ φιλότητος, ἐπεὶ χόλος ἔμπεσε θυμῷ.
Il. xiv. 304-6.

Zeus is captivated by her natural charms, augmented for the occasion by her own skill and the borrowed arts of Kypris ; and she won Hypnos to her counsels by promising to him Pasithee, one of the younger Charites, who had been his passion for many a day. Zeus makes the recital of his wanton loves the overture to his proposal : the wife of Ixion, Danae, Europë, Semele, Alkmene, Demeter, Leto, and lastly, with an awkward compliment, herself. It is a pretty catalogue.

Ares is no better than his father, and persuades Aphrodite, in the absence of her lame husband, Hephaistos. Both pay the penalty, but the chief part was in being found out and laughed at. Hermes and Apollo agree that, though the penalty were thrice as heavy,

αὐτὰρ ἐγὼν εὔδοιμι παρὰ χρυσέῃ Ἀφροδίτῃ.
Od. viii. 342.

These are mortal characteristics : but for the names and the reference to ἰχώρ the beings concerned would be indistinguishable from men. Other qualities, also, belong to the gods which are incompatible with corporeal existence, but the poet does not attempt to reconcile the contradictions into unity. Their movements are swift as thought ; indeed, the thought at times seems to accomplish its own realization.

ὡς δ' ὅτ' ἂν αἰζῇ νόος ἀνέρος, ὅστ' ἐπὶ πολλὴν
γαῖαν ἐληλουθὼς φρεσὶ πευκαλίμῃσι νοήσῃ
ἔνθ' εἴην, ἢ ἔνθα, μενοινήῃσί τε πολλὰ,
ὣς κραιπνῶς μεμαυῖα διέπτατο πότνια Ἥρη.
Il. xv. 80-3.

When she mounts her chariot her steeds leap as far as a

man can see from his watchtower into the mists of the horizon across the sea.

> ὅσσον δ' ἠεροειδὲς ἀνὴρ ἴδεν ὀφθαλμοῖσιν
> ἥμενος ἐν σκοπιῇ, λεύσσων ἐπὶ οἶνοπα πόντον,
> τόσσον ἐπιθρώσκουσι θεῶν ὑψηχέες ἵπποι.
>
> *Il.* v. 770-2.

The gods have the power of becoming invisible. Athene appears suddenly out of the unseen, and again in a moment returns into it. One feels that Homer's theology is to some extent subordinate to his dramatic necessities. A goddess who can become invisible could easily have escaped the stroke of a mortal's spear. Zeus is endued with greater powers. He is not only invisible, but his mind can operate at a distance. By a thought he can strike the bow out of the hand of Teukros and snap the bow-string.

> Τεῦκρος δ' ἄλλον οἰστὸν ἐφ' Ἕκτορι χαλκοκορυστῇ
> αἴνυτο, καί κεν ἔπαυσε μάχην ἐπὶ νηυσὶν Ἀχαιῶν,
> εἴ μιν ἀριστεύοντα βαλὼν ἐξείλετο θυμόν.
> ἀλλ' οὐ λῆθε Διὸς πυκινὸν νόον, ὅς ῥ' ἐφύλασσεν
> Ἕκτορ', ἀτὰρ Τεῦκρον Τελαμώνιον εὖχος ἀπηύρα,
> ὅς οἱ ἐϋστρεφέα νευρὴν ἐν ἀμύμονι τόξῳ
> ῥῆξ' ἐπὶ τῷ ἐρύοντι· παρεπλάγχθη δέ οἱ ἄλλῃ
> ἰὸς χαλκοβαρὴς, τόξον δέ οἱ ἔκπεσε χειρός.
>
> *Il.* xv. 458-65.

What is said of Odysseus,

> ἀλλ' ὅτε δή μιν ἔγειρε Διὸς νόος αἰγιόχοιο,
> σὺν μὲν Τηλεμάχῳ περικαλλέα τεύχε' ἀείρας
> ἐς θάλαμον κατέθηκε καὶ ἐκλήισεν ὀχῆας.
>
> *Od.* xxiv. 164–6.

is not essentially different from "There came a man of God out of Judah by the word of the Lord," or "The Lord spake unto Moses." The difference between the inspiration of the Hebrew prophets and of Odysseus is in its substance rather than in its method of communication. In the one, while it may deal with starting on a journey, or even with the loss of asses, it rises to the loftiest altitudes of moral truth, and is constantly addressing itself to the mind that will listen. In Homer it is concerned with solitary acts

alone, on rare occasions, and of only limited importance. Zeus has not even a Decalogue to instil into the heart of man who looks to him for moral guidance.

In Homer the inspiration may come from other sources. The Amphimedon who says from fuller experience of the afterworld that it was Zeus who moved Odysseus to store the arms in the chamber, says, in the same speech, that it was an evil spirit that led him on his return to the home of the swineherd.

> καὶ τότε δή ῥ' Ὀδυσῆα κακός ποθεν ἤγαγε δαίμων
> ἀγροῦ ἐπ' ἐσχατιὴν, ὅθι δώματα ναῖε συβώτης.
>
> *Od.* xxiv. 149–50.

Possibly the inconsistency is but the same truth viewed from the opposite aspects of the suitor overwhelmed in disaster and of the hero in his success.

Omniscience is a necessary attribute of deity, and in general terms the claim is made on behalf of the Olympians as absolute as that made for Jahveh by the Hebrew prophets. Menelaos says to Eidothee, when he sought to know the cause of the disasters that had befallen the Greeks on their return from Troy,

> ἀλλὰ σύ πέρ μοι εἰπέ (θεοὶ δέ τε πάντα ἴσασιν),
> ὅς τίς μ' ἀθανάτων πεδάᾳ καὶ ἔδησε κελεύθου.
>
> *Od.* iv. 379–80.

To old Proteus he uses the same words.

The knowledge of Zeus compasses the future as well as the past. Penelope, in her prayer to Artemis, says of him :

> ἐς Δία τερπικέραυνον (ὁ γάρ τ' εὖ οἶδεν ἅπαντα,
> μοῖράν τ' ἀμμορίην τε καταθνητῶν ἀνθρώπων).
>
> *Od.* xx. 75–6.

In detail, however, the knowledge of the gods is defective. Hephaistos does not know what is happening in his own home : the sun has to tell him, and he has to tell the rest of the gods. Great Zeus does not detect the guile that is being practised upon him, nor that he is being thwarted upon the battlefield, nor that his counsels are being set at nought, nor, until after the moment of the event, that his

beloved Sarpedon was slain by Patroklos. He has to discover these things, like an ignorant mortal, by the course of events.

The same kind of claim is asserted for the omnipotence of the gods. Mortals cannot dig up the roots of the wonder-working Moly, but the gods can, because

> . . . θεοὶ δέ τε πάντα δύνανται. *Od.* x. 306.

Zeus distributes good or evil to men according to his will: he can withhold and he can bestow, and the reason in each case is the same—he can do everything:

> . . . ἀτὰρ θεὸς ἄλλοτε ἄλλῳ
> Ζεὺς ἀγαθόν τε κακόν τε διδοῖ· δύναται γὰρ ἅπαντα.
> *Od.* iv. 236–7.

> . . . θεὸς δὲ τὸ μὲν δώσει τὸ δ' ἐάσει,
> ὅ τι κεν ᾧ θυμῷ ἐθέλῃ· δύναται γὰρ ἅπαντα.
> *Od.* xiv. 444–5.

Nevertheless, he cannot maintain concord within his own realms, nor subdue his own passions, nor always protect his favourites, nor escape the infatuation of Ate, any more than any mortal can, nor ward off the attacks of perilous sleep, nor perceive that it is by guile a disastrous oath is won from him. At that moment he was no better equipped than Herod Antipas was when the daughter of Herodias danced before him.

The higher qualities of the divine nature, and the negation of them, lie side by side in the poems, but such is the enthralling wizardry of the poet's art that the reader may be no more conscious of the contradiction than the author was himself. The gods were in the making. They stand forth in venerable majesty; their grosser parts are as spots upon their robes, scarce observed in the bright radiance that shines around them and from them. A man became the greater, after all, for the homage he pays to them. The spiritual emerged above the corporeal, and has beaten down the brutish. The path is being prepared for a more sublime conception of the godhead: monotheistic, supreme, father of men, endowed with his like-

ness, Lord of the Universe. Such are the lofty ascriptions to him in the Hymn of Kleanthes :

> κύδιστ' ἀθανάτων, πολυώνυμε, παγκρατὲς αἰεὶ
> Ζεῦ, φύσεως ἀρχηγέ, νόμου μέτα πάντα κυβερνῶν,
> χαῖρε· σὲ γὰρ πάντεσσι θέμις θνητοῖσι προσαυδᾶν,
> ἐκ σοῦ γὰρ γένος ἐσμὲν, ἰῆς μίμημα λαχόντες
> μοῦνον, ὅσα ζώει τε καὶ ἕρπει θνήτ' ἐπὶ γαῖαν . . .
>
> . . . . . .
>
> ὄφρ' ἂν τιμηθέντες ἀμειβώμεσθά σε τιμῇ,
> ὑμνοῦντες τὰ σὰ ἔργα διηνεκὲς, ὡς ἐπέοικε
> θνητὸν ἐόντ'· ἐπεὶ οὔτε βροτοῖς γέρας ἄλλο τι μεῖζον,
> οὔτε θεοῖς, ἢ κοινὸν ἀεὶ νόμον ἐν δίκῃ ὑμνεῖν.

It is comparable to the One Hundredth Psalm : " Know ye that the Lord he is God : it is He that hath made us ; we are His people. Enter into His gates with thanksgiving, and into His courts with praise ; be thankful unto Him, and bless His name." Many Christian hymns have not attained to the altitude of the Stoic's.

There are several further qualities that are now considered essential parts of the divine nature which are not in the Homeric gods. They are not creators. They found the universe ready made to their hand, so did generations of gods before them ; though if Κρόνος be connected with *κραίνω, creare*, it would be an indication that the gods of the Saturnian age were supposed to have something to do with creative work. Origins did not trouble the poet ; he can accept a beginning which has an antecedent.

Neither are the gods eternal. They have a beginning, but they acquired an immortality which their progenitors did not possess. Zeus slew his father, who slew his before him ; but Zeus has become *ἀθάνατος*. The steps of the ascent are not disclosed. Could the *πατὴρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε* be himself destroyed, either by the rest of the gods or by Fate ? It is like a subtle inquiry of the Schoolmen ; yet an answer would indicate with greater clearness how the poet regarded the theological system he was doing so much to create. It would probably be a negative, for what man could adore a being who, while he was

receiving the homage of his worshipper, might be following his progenitors into the land:

> . . . ἵν' Ἰαπετός τε Κρόνος τε
> ἥμενοι οὔτ' αὐγῇς Ὑπερίονος Ἠελίοιο
> τέρποντ' οὔτ' ἀνέμοισι, βαθὺς δέ τε Τάρταρος ἀμφίς.
> *Il.* viii. 479–81.

Many curious problems arise in the mind. If the arrow that struck the gentle Kypris on the hand had reached her head, or the place where in man the heart is found, would she have escaped death, immortal that she was? If all the gods of Olympus could not equal Zeus when he was awake, might not revolt successfully overthrow him when he was asleep? Might not Fate, also, hurl him from his throne? Yet the heroes had no sacrifices to offer it, though it was invincible, apparently eternal, for *οὐκ ἦν πότε οὐκ ἦν*, to borrow a phrase of the early Christian theologians, there was no time when it was not, nor would it ever cease to be. It was an abstraction to which the Homeric theology never gave personality.

A more serious defect of the Olympians was that they were not moral examples to the men who worshipped them. More than anything else this defect was their undoing. Men could not continue to adore gods who were morally inferior to the mortals they appointed to death. The penetrating shafts of the philosophers smote them, and neither the arts of the allegorizer nor the subtleties of the reasoner could successfully defend them. Homer had made them too human in their imperfections, and, though almost their creator, he could not save them. He helped to dig their grave while building their temples and erecting their thrones.

The problem of the origin of evil has baffled the acutest minds, and the world has not yet seen a satisfactory answer to the question how a creation in which there is evil can be reconciled with a Creator who is omnipotent and righteous. The prophets of Hebraism had no reply, nor had the writers of the New Testament. A fallen Lucifer, who becomes the Prince of this world, to wage war not without success against his all-powerful van-

quisher, does not satisfy the mind. It only transfers the problem from earth to heaven. How did evil, and on such a colossal scale, enter the celestial realms of righteousness ?

Homer, even if he were conscious of the problem, is not troubled by it. In naïve simplicity he makes Zeus the author of both good and evil.

δοιοὶ γάρ τε πίθοι κατακείαται ἐν Διὸς οὔδει
δώρων οἷα δίδωσι, κακῶν, ἕτερος δὲ ἑάων·
ᾧ μέν κ' ἀμμιξας δοίη Ζεὺς τερπικέραυνος,
ἄλλοτε μέν τε κακῷ ὅγε κύρεται, ἄλλοτε δ' ἐσθλῷ·
ᾧ δέ κε τῶν λυγρῶν δοίη, λωβητὸν ἔθηκεν·
καί ἑ κακὴ βούβρωστις ἐπὶ χθόνα δῖαν ἐλαύνει.

Il. xxiv. 527-32.

The gods, who know neither sorrow nor feeling, have a satisfaction, almost a delight, in human woe. They bestow on Peleus from his birth blessings beyond all other men, not for his merits, but because it was their will ; for no better reason evil is sent upon him :

ἀλλ' ἐπὶ καὶ τῷ θῆκε θεὸς κακόν, *Il.* xxiv. 538.

Priam was subject to the same experience. His kingdom and his wealth, his poverty and his woe, were all decreed by the same minds at their arbitrary will.

αὐτὰρ ἐπεί τοι πῆμα τόδ' ἤγαγον Οὐρανίωνες.

Il. xxiv. 547.

There may be something of dramatic appropriateness in making a noble hero, thinking of the lonely sorrows of his own father, speak such words to the father of Hektor ; but the idea is too frequently expressed for that. It is a commonplace of life. Of Odysseus, Philoitios, the herdsman, says to his comrade Eumaios, the swineherd :

ἀλλὰ θεοὶ δυόωσι πολυπλάγκτους ἀνθρώπους,
ὁππότε καὶ βασιλεῦσιν ἐπικλώσωνται ὀϊζύν. *Od.* xx. 195-6.

The swineherd replies, saying bitterly the same thing :

Ζεῦ πάτερ, οὔ τις σεῖο θεῶν ὀλοώτερος ἄλλος·
οὐκ ἐλεαίρεις ἄνδρας, ἐπὴν δὴ γείνεαι αὐτὸς,
μισγέμεναι κακότητι καὶ ἄλγεσι λευγαλέοισιν. *Od.* xx. 201-3.

There was cruelty with the omnipotent gods : Zeus was a father that tortured his children. Some of the sins of men arose out of their own perverse nature ; others, however, are directly instigated by Zeus. He sends a lying dream with fair words to Agamemnon :

> . . . Διὸς δέ τοι ἄγγελός εἰμι,
> ὅς σεῦ ἄνευθεν ἐὼν μέγα κήδεται ἠδ' ἐλεαίρει.
> . . . νῦν γάρ κεν ἕλοις πόλιν εὐρυάγυιαν
> Τρώων. *Il.* ii. 26, 27, 29.

It accomplished the designed purpose, and leads to defeat, not victory. The king blames Zeus for the evils that befell the Greeks in consequence of the anger of Achilleus. A man may often charge heaven with his own follies, but he gets no one to believe him. The Greeks accepted Agamemnon's extenuation ; to them it was a just explanation. He was helpless in the hands of the god : no man can resist Ate if great Zeus cannot, and Ate is sent from him.

> οὐ δυνάμην λελαθέσθ' Ἄτης, ἣ πρῶτον ἀάσθην.
> ἀλλ' ἐπεὶ ἀασάμην καί μευ φρένας ἐξέλετο Ζεύς.
> *Il.* xix. 136-7.

Who could fasten upon him the blame for what had happened ?

The Zeus of Homer is where the god of the Jew was when

> ὁ θεὸς ἐπείρασε τὸν Ἀβραάμ,

by commanding him to sacrifice his only son ; but Zeus did not intervene to prevent the accomplishment of the deed. The Hebrew story is doubtless some form of myth to explain the introduction of a surrogate for human sacrifice. The later writer gives to it a moral significance : it was a trial of Abraham's faith, out of which he emerged triumphant. The later apologists for Homer essayed the same thing for Zeus, but having less satisfactory material they failed.

The dishonourable violation of the treaty is not the work of men : Zeus alone contrived it. As a result of his bargaining with Herë, an anomalous proceeding for omnipotence, and at her suggestion, a contradictory

exigency for omniscience, he sends Athene in the likeness of Laodokos, son of Antenor, to cause the Trojans to break the treaty oath.

> αὐτίκ' Ἀθηναίην ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα,
> αἶψα μάλ' ἐς στρατὸν ἐλθὲ μετὰ Τρῶας καὶ Ἀχαιούς,
> πειρᾶν δ' ὥς κε Τρῶες ὑπερκύδανταϛ Ἀχαιοὺς
> ἄρξωσι πρότεροι ὑπὲρ ὅρκια δηλήσασθαι. *Il.* iv. 69-72.

She finds Pandaros, and appearing to him in the guise of his comrade persuades him to send an arrow stealthily against Menelaos and so win renown for himself amongst the Trojans. Her instigation is subtly ornamented with the suggestion that he should gain success for his deed by vowing a hecatomb of firstlings of the flock to Apollo the archer (*Il.* iv, 93–126). Yet Agamemnon is confident that the god who instigated the treachery will take vengeance for it upon the Trojans.

> Ζεὺς δέ σφι Κρονίδης ὑψίζυγος, αἰθέρι ναίων,
> αὐτὸς ἐπισσείῃσιν ἐρεμνὴν αἰγίδα πᾶσιν
> τῆσδ' ἀπάτης κοτέων. *Il.* iv. 166-8.

Athene, by her deception, causes the death of Hektor, first by assuming the form of his brother Deiphobos, so encouraging him to feel that help was near him in his conflict; then by deserting him at the critical moment, handing back to Achilles the spear that missed the soldier she had tricked. The cry of Hektor is pathetic: it is an indictment against the gods.

> ὤ πόποι, ἦ μάλα δή με θεοὶ θάνατόνδε κάλεσαν·
> Δηΐφοβον γὰρ ἔγωγ' ἐφάμην ἥρωα παρεῖναι·
> ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν ἐν τείχει, ἐμὲ δ' ἐξαπάτησεν Ἀθήνη.
> *Il.* xxii. 297-9.

These events are more significant than the railings of disappointed men: they are the warp and weft of the story, and they have a logic of their own. They lead to fields of battle, strewn with the bodies of the slain, to multiplying the numbers of weeping widows and orphans, and to making noble women into slaves; and the gods bring these things to pass by treachery and duplicity.

There is necessarily another side to the picture of the

Olympians. Gods who were nothing else than such as they showed themselves in these episodes would be little better than fiends. They were not that. Homer's sense of justice, as well as his dramatic art, kept him from a mere caricature of godhead. Loftier conceptions, such as the soul of man was aspiring after, were struggling towards expression. Zeus in the *Odyssey*, who in several respects is different from the Zeus in the *Iliad*, repudiates the accusation that the gods are the authors of sin and its consequences of woe. Mortals themselves are alone to blame: they sow the wind, like Aigisthos, though, like him, they are warned by the gods against their infatuation.

ὦ πόποι, οἷον δή νυ θεοὺς βροτοὶ αἰτιόωνται.
ἐξ ἡμέων γάρ φασι κάκ' ἔμμεναι· οἱ δὲ καὶ αὐτοὶ
σφῇσιν ἀτασθαλίῃσιν ὑπὲρ μόρον ἄλγε' ἔχουσιν,
ὡς καὶ νῦν Αἴγισθος. *Od.* i. 32-5.

The good wherewith men are blessed comes from Zeus.

Ζεὺς δ' αὐτὸς νέμει ὄλβον Ὀλύμπιος ἀνθρώποισιν,
ἐσθλοῖς ἠδὲ κακοῖσιν, ὅπως ἐθέλῃσιν, ἑκάστῳ. *Od.* vi. 188-9.

The words bear something more than a superficial resemblance to the word spoken later, "For He maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust" (Matt. v, 45). No blessing crowns the evil deed. The gods do not love it, nor the man without regard for the retribution they will surely send upon the wrongdoer.

χοίρε' ἀτὰρ σιάλους γε σύας μνηστῆρες ἔδουσιν,
οὐκ ὄπιδα φρονέοντες ἐνὶ φρεσὶν οὐδ' ἐλεητύν.
οὐ μὲν σχέτλια ἔργα θεοὶ μάκαρες φιλέουσιν,
ἀλλὰ δίκην τίουσι καὶ αἴσιμα ἔργ' ἀνθρώπων. *Od.* xiv. 81-4.

The old writer that maintained that the subject of the Homeric poems was righteousness had not a little to urge in his justification. The companions of Odysseus suffer for their wanton disobedience to the most solemn warnings: Odysseus suffers, vicariously to a great extent, because he was with them, and, as it ever is in the ways of life, the only hope for them, when there is any, is in

his willingness to suffer with them. The suitors perish because of their unrestrained wickedness. They were an offence to the gods, and the gods in justice sent swift death upon them. The Athene who deceived Pandaros and Hektor is at the side of Odysseus to help him in the divine work of vengeance.

It is not possible to read the closing books of the *Odyssey* without feeling a moral exaltation at the chastisement that comes with tragic awe upon the crimes of arrogance and lust. The women likewise deserve their fate.

> . . . καὶ ἐκλελάθοιντ' Ἀφροδίτης
> τὴν ἄρ' ὑπὸ μνηστῆρσιν ἔχον, μίσγοντό τε λάθρῃ . . .
> . . . αἳ δὴ ἐμῇ κεφαλῇ κατ' ὀνείδεα χεῦαν
> μητέρι θ' ἡμετέρῃ, παρά τε μνηστῆρσιν ἴαυον.
>
> *Od.* xxii. 444-5, 463-4.

There is justice in heaven after all : though it walk slowly, as with lame feet, it overtakes the evildoer.

> τούσδε δὲ μοῖρ' ἐδάμασσε θεῶν καὶ σχέτλια ἔργα·
> οὔ τινα γὰρ τίεσκον ἐπιχθονίων ἀνθρώπων . . .
> τῷ καὶ ἀτασθαλίῃσιν ἀεικέα πότμον ἐπέσπον.
>
> *Od.* xxii. 413, 414, 416.

It is not hard to hear the poet in the lofty words of his hero. They are the natural theology of a noble soul, by which he teaches the world the lesson he has learned in his way through it. The lesson is the old, eternal one :

" I was envious at the prosperity of the wicked ; . . . pride compasseth them about as a chain ; violence covereth them as a garment. They set their mouth against the heavens, and their tongue walketh through the earth. . . . Surely thou didst set them in slippery places ; thou castest them down into destruction. How are they brought into desolation, as in a moment ! They are utterly consumed with terrors " (Psalm lxxiii, 3, etc.).

A startling and unexpected stain upon the character of the Olympian gods is their jealousy of mankind. If they have bodies like men it is consistent that they should be moved by human passions ; but their condition would seem to remove them beyond the reach of jealousy of

poor mortals. They enjoy a happiness that the children of this earth can never possess; death cannot touch them, nor old age; though they have the capacity for tears they seldom have cause to shed them. They dwell in an ideal felicity, amidst perpetual sunshine. Man cannot rival them, nor withstand them, yet they are jealous of him, to snatch away such fleeting happiness as may come to him.

Bellerophon has done no wrong, unless prosperity, valour, and happiness be wrongs; yet the gods hated him and afflicted him, and Artemis, in wrath, slew his daughter, apparently for no other reason than the relationship.

ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ καὶ κεῖνος ἀπήχθετο πᾶσι θεοῖσιν,
ἤτοι ὁ κὰπ πεδίον τὸ Ἀλήϊον οἶος ἀλᾶτο,
ὃν θυμὸν κατέδων, πάτον ἀνθρώπων ἀλεείνων,
Ἰσανδρον δέ οἱ υἱὸν Ἄρης ἅτος πολέμοιο
μαρνάμενον Σολύμοισι κατέκτανε κυδαλίμοισιν,
τὴν δὲ χολωσαμένη χρυσήνιος Ἀρτεμις ἔκτα. *Il.* vi. 200-5.

It is their habit to act so: that is why they separate Penelope and Odysseus, and bring the arrogant suitors into the house. Their happiness was "too good to last," and the gods saw to it that it did not.

. . . θεοὶ δ' ὤπαζον οἰξύν,
οἳ νῶϊν ἀγάσαντο παρ' ἀλλήλοισιν μένοντε
ἤβης ταρπῆναι καὶ γήραος οὐδὸν ἱκέσθαι. *Od.* xxiii. 210-12.

Penelope has no other reason to suggest. Menelaos suggests a similar reason for the non-return of Odysseus:

ἀλλὰ τὰ μέν που μέλλεν ἀγάσσεσθαι θεὸς αὐτὸς,
ὃς κεῖνον δύστηνον ἀνόστιμον οἷον ἔθηκεν. *Od.* iv. 181-2.

The Phaiakeans had become such skilled mariners that their ships were like miracle craft, needing neither pilot nor helm: they knew the mind of their commanders and the ways of the deep, and no shipwreck could befall them. The men and their ships were at the service of every sailor of the high seas. Their immunity and their benevolence roused the envy of Poseidon, who cuts them off from all intercourse with the sea.

. . . ὃς ἔφασκε Ποσειδάων' ἀγάσασθαι
ἡμῖν, οὕνεκα πομποὶ ἀπήμονές εἰμεν ἁπάντων.
φῇ ποτὲ Φαιήκων ἀνδρῶν εὐεργέα νῆα
ἐκ πομπῆς ἀνιοῦσαν ἐν ἠεροειδέϊ πόντῳ
ῥαισέμεναι, μέγα δ' ἤμιν ὄρος πόλει ἀμφικαλύψειν.
Od. viii. 565-9.

Kalypso may be regarded as knowing the nature of the gods intimately : she describes them even more bitterly than Penelope, and charges them with the same kind of crime against Orion and Iasion as they had committed against herself.

σχέτλιοί ἐστε, θεοί, ζηλήμονες ἔξοχον ἄλλων,
οἵ τε θεαῖς ἀγάασθε παρ' ἀνδράσιν εὐνάζεσθαι
ἀμφαδίην, ἤν τίς τε φίλον ποιήσετ' ἀκοίτην.
ὡς μὲν ὅτ' Ὠρίων' ἕλετο ῥοδοδάκτυλος Ἠώς,
τόφρα οἱ ἠγάασθε θεοὶ ῥεῖα ζώοντες,
ἕως μιν ἐν Ὀρτυγίῃ χρυσόθρονος Ἄρτεμις ἁγνὴ
οἷς ἀγανοῖς βελέεσσιν ἐποιχομένη κατέπεφνεν.
ὡς δ' ὁπότ' Ἰασίωνι ἐϋπλόκαμος Δημήτηρ,
ᾧ θυμῷ εἴξασα, μίγη φιλότητι καὶ εὐνῇ
νειῷ ἔνι τριπόλῳ· οὐδὲ δὴν ἦεν ἄπυστος
Ζεύς, ὅς μιν κατέπεφνε βαλὼν ἀργῆτι κεραυνῷ.
Od. v. 118-28.

The envy of the gods was an endeavour to find an interpretation of the mysterious ways of providence. Men often fell with dramatic suddenness from the highest prosperity to the lowest poverty, from the most radiant happiness to the blackest misery. In those days there must have been many bereaved Priams and Hekubes, captive Andromaches, and lonely Penelopes. Their lot had not befallen without the gods, yet no exceptional or conspicuous wrong could be charged against them. The only things discernible wherein they differed from others were their misery and the felicity from which they had fallen. The one was regarded as the cause of the other. The gods could not tolerate human happiness beyond measure ; therefore they debased the exalted from their high estate and humbled the mighty. Piety could not appease them : nobility of character could not avert their

malevolence. Prosperity is an unsatisfactory reward for righteousness; so is affliction. Adversity may be the school of character, but the Olympians did not send it as moral discipline. Athene did not abandon Hektor to his death that he might become a nobler hero, or a martyr, or the founder of a great cause; Andromache and her infant son were not delivered up to slavery that they might obtain a nobler inheritance of mind and soul; Bellerophon was not driven to wander in the wilderness that he might develop a more estimable manhood.

These human beings were happy, too happy, therefore the gods put the cup of sorrow to their lips and make them drink it. Earth must not resemble heaven: the gulf between men and gods must be kept wide, and when some promontory juts forward from the earthward shore it must be shattered, together with those whose sole misfortune and fault is that they stand upon it.

It was a melancholy and depressing view of human life, as well as of the divine beings. It drove justice out of the heavenly places, and made man the sport of the gods and not their care. Olympus looked down upon men it had appointed unto sorrow somewhat as the Roman lords looked upon the combatants wounded and dying in the arena.

No theological system is consistent, but the system which introduced the φθόνος τῶν θεῶν tolerated inconsistencies that were fatal. If the gods ruled the affairs of men they were responsible for the advancement of men to their happiness; when they deposed them from it they were inflicting retribution upon them for what they themselves had done. It is another aspect of the doctrine that the gods lead man into sin, and then punish him for it.

Men endure patiently the anomalies of their religious beliefs; perhaps for a long time they are unconscious of them. They have the singular faculty of sectional thinking, especially upon matters in which they are deeply concerned. The listeners of the Homeric rhapsodists were probably unconscious of the ultimate implications of ascribing envy and jealousy to their gods, as well

as the poet. They were alike satisfied with the departmental interpretation of life.

What is merely germinal and incidental in Homer later becomes the philosophy of life. It is an indication of the creative power of these poems that Homer made the theology of the Greeks. The historian himself was greatly influenced by them, and therein he was doubtless typical of his race. The envy of the gods is to him a dread reality, haunting man in the hour of his prosperity, relentlessly working out its purpose, though the selected victim seeks to propitiate it by the sacrifice of self and the surrender of things dearest to the heart.

Amasis, who had risen from the lowliest station to the most exalted, and had endeavoured by a humble bearing to avert the doom that is wont to hide in such success, for he knew that the gods were envious, is troubled at the unbroken prosperity of his royal neighbour, Polykrates, and urges him to take the most precious of his possessions, the loss of which would afflict his soul with the greatest sorrow, and cast it away (Hdt. iii, 40). The advice is taken, and Polykrates publicly throws into the sea his signet ring, the work of a certain Theodoros of Samos.

Five days later it is brought back to him in a choice fish, the present of a fisherman. He regards it as a miracle wrought on his behalf by the gods; *θεῖον εἶναι τὸ πρῆγμα*, and sends an account of it to his friend. Amasis now knows that Polykrates is a doomed man, and severs all association with him. It was equally divine to him, but the significance of the miracle was that the gods were adorning their victim before they smote him, and were but leading him nearer to the altar where he was to be sacrificed.

Such is the story told by Herodotus, who recounts it just as a man would who sincerely believed it. He shares the inconsistency of his predecessor the poet. If the gods wrought that miracle, why should Polykrates be punished for the prosperity they forced upon him, and which he tried to escape? Amasis ought to have repudiated those gods rather than his friend. But men are more tolerant of wrong in exalted places than in lowly.

The historian has another story with the same moral; only in this instance he is undoubtedly speaking in his own person, though in a dramatic form. Xerxes convokes the assembly of the Persian nobles, and informs them of his proposed expedition against Greece and requires of them their loyal co-operation. Herodotus provides the leaders with their speeches. Mardonios applauds the scheme, but Artabanos, though at the risk of the king's displeasure, opposes it, and on the ground that if he succeed his greatness would challenge the envious gods to smite him with destruction.

ὁρᾷς τὰ ὑπερέχοντα ξῶα ὡς κεραυνοῖ ὁ θεὸς, οὐδὲ ἐᾷ φαντάζεσθαι, τὰ δὲ σμικρὰ οὐδέν μιν κνίζει; ὁρᾷς δὲ ὡς ἐς οἰκήματα τὰ μέγιστα αἰεὶ καὶ δένδρεα τὰ τοιαῦτα ἀποσκήπτει τὰ βέλεα; . . . . . οὐ γὰρ ἐᾷ φρονέειν μέγα ὁ θεὸς ἄλλον ἢ ἑωυτόν.

Hdt. vii. 10.

The sequel to the story is as curious as the one about Polykrates. After Xerxes had recovered from his anger he changes his mind, and decides to abandon his expedition; but a vision warns him against his new course, and at its second appearance added threats of dire consequences. Artabanos scorns the dream: it is no divine thing; it is merely the reaction in the mind of the king of the thoughts of the day (Hdt. vii, 16). If it be really divine, let it appear to him as it appeared to the king. It does, and its terrible words dismay him, and it seemed to him as though it would burn out his eyes with red-hot irons. With a loud shriek he awakes, and hastens to Xerxes to urge him upon the course from which he had endeavoured to dissuade him. The king regards the vision as sent from the gods; his sceptical councillor is forced to the same judgement; and Herodotus is certainly expressing his own belief under the veil of his characters.

The gods force the reluctant monarch upon a course which ends disastrously for himself and his people, not because either had wrought evil in the days of their prosperity, but solely because of their own jealousy. They smote men with the terror of their judgements, as the lightnings smote the trees, because they were more

lofty than their neighbours. Neither force was moral: there was no more guilt in an exalted man than in a tall tree nurtured to its height by the sun and the rain and the winds of heaven.

The great lyric poet, contemporary with the historian, shares his view: the great contemporary dramatist gives to the doctrine, apparently for the first time, an ethical interpretation.

Pindar beseeches the immortals not to send their envious stroke upon him, because he is joyous enough to sing and to crown his head with chaplets:

> . . . ἀείσομαι
> χαίταν στεφάνοισιν ἁρ-
> μόσαις. ὁ δ' ἀθανάτων
> μὴ θρασσέτω φθόνος,
> ὅ τι τερπνὸν ἐφάμερον διώκων
> ἔκαλος ἔπειμι, γῆρας ἔς τε τὸν μόρσιμον
> αἰῶνα. *Pind. Isthm.* vii. 53-9.

The gods encounter a man after a career of pleasurable wickedness, to inflict upon him a just retribution; but they also cover with confusion a man who pursues the innocent pleasures of the day, and he, too, falls from his heaven, as Bellerophon was flung from his winged horse by Zeus.

When he praises the city of Corinth for its wealth and greatness, in words that add to the lustre of its history, he prays Zeus not to visit the city in envy because of his eulogy.

> ὕπατ', εὐρὺ ἀνάσσων
> Ὀλυμπίας, ἀφθόνητος ἔπεσσιν
> γένοιο χρόνον ἅπαντα, Ζεῦ πάτερ,
> καὶ τόνδε λαὸν ἀβλαβῆ νέμων. *Olymp.* xiii. 34-7.

Great Zeus will not banish envy from his heart unless he be invoked to it; perchance not even then. The household of Aleuas, the Thessalian, was rich with many blessings, both inherited and acquired; therefore he prays that the envious gods send it no reversal of fortune. It is the kind of thing they do.

λαχόντες οὐκ ὀλίγαν
δόσιν, μὴ φθονεραῖς ἐκ θεῶν
μετατροπίαις ἐπικύρσαιεν. θεὸς εἴη
ἀπήμων κέαρ. εὐδαίμων δὲ καὶ ὑ-
μνητὸς οὗτος ἀνὴρ γίγνεται σοφοῖς,
ὅς ἂν χερσὶν ἢ ποδῶν ἀρετᾷ κρατήσαις.
τὰ μέγιστ' ἀέθλων ἔλῃ. *Pyth.* x. 30-7.

In Aischylos there is visible the transition from the doctrine of an envy that had no moral qualities into a righteous judgement against pride. It may be possible to trace the poet's religious emancipation from the coarser to the nobler conception. In the *Prometheus Vinctus*, written not later than 470 B.C., the envy of Zeus is represented in all its native ugliness. He is jealous of the whole human race; and its benefactor, who gave it the primal blessing of fire, is punished by him with awful and age-long tortures.

Ἥφαιστε, σοὶ δὲ χρὴ μέλειν ἐπιστολὰς
ἅς σοι πατὴρ ἐφεῖτο, τόνδε πρὸς πέτραις
ὑψηλοκρήμνοις τὸν λεωργὸν ὀχμάσαι
ἀδαμαντίνων δεσμῶν ἐν ἀρρήκτοις πέδαις.
τὸ σὸν γὰρ ἄνθος, παντέχνου πυρὸς σέλας,
θνητοῖσι κλέψας ὤπασεν· τοιᾶσδέ τοι
ἁμαρτίας σφε δεῖ θεοῖς δοῦναι δίκην,
ὡς ἂν διδαχθῇ τὴν Διὸς τυραννίδα
στέργειν, φιλανθρώπου δὲ παύεσθαι τρόπου.
Prom. V. 3-11.

That drama is an unfinished chapter—a decapitated statue. It is the world's sorrow that the *Prometheus Unbound* has been lost in Time's deep waters. The subsequent reconciliation between the offended god and man's benefactor would almost certainly have been a justification of the ways of god to man.

In the *Persæ* the Messenger, who relates the destruction of the forces of Xerxes, speaks the old language:

ὁ δ' εὐθὺς ὡς ἤκουσεν, οὐ ξυνεὶς δόλον
Ἕλληνος ἀνδρὸς, οὐδὲ τὸν θεῶν φθόνον,
πᾶσιν προφωνεῖ τόνδε ναυάρχοις λόγον . . .
Pers. 361-3.

The Chorus in the opening ode speaks in the same way :

δολόμητιν δ' ἀπάταν θεοῦ τίς ἀνὴρ θνατὸς ἀλύξει ;

Darius gives the true explanation. The disaster was the direct consequence of criminal arrogance, wanton destruction, and impiety (803-22). Zeus is a just god : his judgements fall upon the head that cries aloud for them.

In the *Agamemnon*, 459 B.C., the poet's emancipation from the current base theology is manifest and complete. The current view is represented only to be disavowed. The Chorus repeats it :

μάλα γέ τοι τὸ μεγάλας ὑγιείας
ἀκόρεστον τέρμα. νόσος γὰρ ἀεὶ
γείτων ὁμότοιχος ἐρείδει,
καὶ πότμος εὐθυπορῶν
*ἀνδρὸς ἔπαισεν * **
** * ἄφαντον ἔρμα.*
καὶ τὸ μὲν πρὸ χρημάτων
κτησίων ὄκνος βαλὼν
σφενδόνας ἀπ' εὐμέτρου,
οὐκ ἔδυ πρόπας δόμος,
πημονᾶς γέμων ἄγαν,
οὐδ' ἐπόντισε σκάφος. *Agam.* 1001-13.

The Chorus, continuing, illustrates the argument with the fate of Aiskulapios, who learned the secret of restoring life to the dead (1022-24). Agamemnon himself is made to express the same idea :

μηδ' εἵμασι στρώσασ' ἐπίφθονον πόρον
τίθει· θεούς τοι τοῖσδε τιμαλφεῖν χρεών·
ἐν ποικίλοις δὲ θνητὸν ὄντα κάλλεσιν
βαίνειν ἐμοὶ μὲν οὐδαμῶς ἄνευ φόβου.
λέγω κατ' ἄνδρα, μὴ θεὸν, σέθειν ἐμέ. *Agam.* 921-25.

These interpretations of life, and of the gods, are deliberately rejected, though the poet stand alone in his opinion. Excessive prosperity is the mother of Insolence, and Insolence begets *κόρος* and *θράσος*, the two dark children of woe, in its own image. It is the guilt that lives with golden prosperity that calls down the curse, not the

prosperity. Justice is impartial: it honours the holy life, whether it be in a cottage or in a palace (750-81). Zeus is vindicated: his ways are the ways of righteousness. Man receives his just deserts:

ἔπραξεν ὡς ἔκρανεν.

Agamemnon perishes because he laid his daughter as a victim upon the sacrificial altar,

ἔτλα δ' οὖν θυτὴρ γενέσθαι θυγατρός. *Agam.* 224.

not because he stepped upon fair trappings amidst the honours of his household. Aigisthos and Klytaimnestra will perish because of their common guilt, and not because of their exalted station.

Men live in a moral world under a moral government, and no bulwark, though it avail against his fellows, can protect the wrongdoer from the retribution that inevitably descends upon him from a righteous and outraged heaven.

πᾶν δ' ἐπὶ τέρμα νωμᾷ. *Agam.* 781.

οὐ γὰρ ἔστιν ἔπαλξις
πλούτου πρὸς κόρον ἀνδρὶ
λακτίσαντι μέγαν δίκας βωμὸν εἰς ἀφάνειαν.
βιᾶται δ' ἀ τάλαινα πειθὼ,
προβουλόπαις ἄφερτος ἄτας·
ἄκος δὲ πᾶν μάταιον. οὐκ ἐκρύφθη,
πρέπει δὲ, φῶς αἰνολαμπὲς, σίνος. *Agam.* 381-8.

The monotheism of Aischylos is the exaltation of the Homeric Zeus to the solitary throne towards which he was occasionally directing his vision, together with the expulsion of the grosser elements and the imperfect deities that still clung to his robes. As Homer lifted him above the animal and snake gods that were wholly of earth, earthy, and raised him into the heavenly places, so Aischylos exalted him above his companions and ascribed to him a divine mind on a level with his station. Moral qualities are the stars in his crown.

The monotheism of Kleanthes, the Stoic, is the spiritual descendant of the doctrines of Aischylos. His Hymn to

Zeus is probably the most beautiful expression of religious adoration in Hellenic literature. Zeus is Lord of Heaven as well as of earth: he is *κύδιστ' ἀθανάτων*, and *φύσεως ἀρχηγέ*. His attributes are wisdom and righteousness. The things he cannot endure are guilty ambition, avarice, and lust: it is these he visits with a curse. There is no room for envy of human happiness and prosperity in his being. He is verily Father of men, and they are his children, upon whom he bestows the multitude of his gifts.

Homer said much the same things, but in a different way and in a different setting. Zeus is the giver of wealth and happiness, says Nausikaa to the shipwrecked Odysseus. Kleanthes, the man who refused the minæ the court awarded him when it learned how he earned by his nightly toil of water-carrying the scanty means for the leisure of his studies by day, knew that wealth was not happiness: that *ὄλβος* was not both. The actual gifts of the gods to Odysseus were suffering and affliction.

ὥ μοι ἐγὼ σέο, τέκνον, ἀμήχανος· ἦ σε περὶ Ζεὺς
ἀνθρώπων ἤχθηρε θεουδέα θυμὸν ἔχοντα. *Od.* xix. 363-4.

The shipwrecked mariner was a proof of that to Nausikaa, just as he was when he stood a tattered beggar before Penelope. The only thing he can do is to endure his fate:

καί που σοὶ τά γ' ἔδωκε, σὲ δὲ χρὴ τετλάμεν ἔμπης.
Od. vi. 190.

Homer had said that wrongdoing does not prosper, and he said it by the lips of one of the gods:

ὣδε δέ τις εἴπεσκεν ἰδὼν ἐς πλησίον ἄλλον·
οὐκ ἀρετᾷ κακὰ ἔργα· κιχάνει τοι βραδὺς ὠκύν,
ὡς καὶ νῦν Ἥφαιστος ἐὼν βραδὺς εἷλεν Ἄρηα.
Od. viii. 328-30.

But it was said to the sound of Olympian laughter at one of their number being discovered and penalized with the *μοιχάγρια*. The gods honour justice and integrity:

ἀλλὰ δίκην τίουσι καὶ αἴσιμα ἔργ' ἀνθρώπων. *Od.* xiv. 84.

They unite with the native forces of wickedness to overthrow the wicked, but there was not enough consistent sincerity in their own conduct to impart a full reality to their moral attributes. Their actions gave probability to the hypothesis of their envy.

In Kleanthes malign φθόνος has left Zeus just as completely as the snake and the altar reeking with human blood. Some of the Hebrew prophets had less noble conceptions of the glory of the divine majesty, and even Christian writers at times have ascribed less worthy attributes to the god of their adoration. Had Kleanthes been able to finish his work, or had the Greek mind been able to bear it, there might have been in Hellas a religion that could have presented to the advance of Christianity a barrier which might have confined it to the home of its origin, to expire perhaps after its first failures and disappointed expectations.

The task was too great for the poet, and his race was unequal to the steep ascent. The vision, because it was not followed, vanished, the coarse elements asserted their supremacy and then hastened to their just destruction. The people had looked, admired, but betrayed the trust that came to them.

Chapter XI. Homer: Men and Gods

SUCH, in the main, were the conceptions of the attitude of the gods towards men held by Homer, and by those who in the earlier periods listened to his poems. What was man's responsive attitude towards the gods? Creed leads to action, and action is the surest interpreter of creed, for it is selective of the important and recusant of the negligible. The religious actions of men are of two classes: those done directly towards the gods—worship; and those concerned with conduct—morals.

The worship of the Homeric hero comprised those two elements of sacrifice and prayer which were born with religion and which will probably survive to the end of time. Man stands before the gods with an offering in his hands and a petition upon his lips. In the beginning each was part of the other: the one was introductory, the other was the conclusion. They hold the same relationship even to-day in some minds. The gift is to prepare the way for the prayer, just as it did when the proverb first gained currency, "The gods know who gives them the most presents."

πείθειν δῶρα καὶ θεοὺς λόγος.

Eur. *Med.* 964.

Many to-day are nearer Homer than Plato, though their anger would rise at being told so.

καὶ γὰρ ἂν δεινὸν εἴη, εἰ πρὸς τὰ δῶρα καὶ τὰς θυσίας ἀποβλέπουσιν ἡμῶν οἱ θεοί, ἀλλὰ μὴ πρὸς τὴν ψυχήν, ἄν τις ὅσιος καὶ δίκαιος ὢν τυγχάνῃ.

Plato, *Alc.* ii. 149 E.

In Homer hecatombs are to win the favour of the gods: the worshipper gave to them the pleasing savour of sheep and goats of the altar; they in return bestow what is pleasing to him. It is a matter of purchase, τέχνη εὐπορική, as Plato describes it.

The question with the purchaser is the common one, are the goods worth the cost? Chryses had built a temple to Apollo, and had burnt upon his altar many a bull and goat.

Σμινθεῦ, εἴποτέ τοι χαρίεντ' ἐπὶ νηὸν ἔρεψα,
ἢ εἰ δή ποτέ τοι κατὰ πίονα μηρί' ἔκηα
ταύρων ἠδ' αἰγῶν, τόδε μοι κρήηνον ἐέλδωρ.

Il. i. 39-41.

When the time comes the return he asks for is that the shafts of the god may make the Danaioi pay for their misdeeds with their sufferings.

τίσειαν Δαναοὶ ἐμὰ δάκρυα σοῖσι βέλεσσιν.

Il. i. 42.

The Danaioi, on their part, gave an ἱερὴν ἑκατόμβην to induce the god to stay the plague. The offering that Helenos, οἰωνοπόλων ὄχ' ἄριστος (*Il.* vi, 76), instructed Hektor to command the matrons of Troy to offer to Athene for the safety of their city was the choicest and largest peplum and twelve young heifers a year old.

Ἕκτορ, ἀτὰρ σὺ πόλινδε μετέρχεο, εἰπὲ δ' ἔπειτα
μητέρι σῇ καὶ ἐμῇ· ἡ δὲ ξυνάγουσα . . .
πέπλον, ὅ οἱ δοκέει χαριέστατος ἠδὲ μέγιστος
εἶναι ἐνὶ μεγάρῳ καί οἱ πολὺ φίλτατος αὐτῇ,
θεῖναι Ἀθηναίης ἐπὶ γούνασιν ἠϋκόμοιο,
καί οἱ ὑποσχέσθαι δυοκαίδεκα βοῦς ἐνὶ νηῷ
ἥνις ἠκέστας ἱερευσέμεν, αἴ κ' ἐλεήσῃ
ἄστυ τε καὶ Τρώων ἀλόχους καὶ νήπια τέκνα.

Il. vi. 86, 87, 90-95.

Odysseus, when he prays for a safe return from the expedition to Troy, offered as burnt sacrifice to Zeus more than any mortal before him.

οὐ γάρ πώ τις τόσσα βροτῶν Διὶ τερπικεραύνῳ
πίονα μηρί' ἔκη, οὐδ' ἐξαίτους ἑκατόμβας,
ὅσσα σὺ τῷ ἐδίδως, ἀρώμενος ἔως ἵκοιο
γῆράς τε λιπαρὸν θρέψαιό τε φαίδιμον υἱόν.

Od. xix. 365-8.

Sometimes but a single ox is sacrificed before the assembled household and its guests, and "many prayers" were offered by the master of the house, who was the high-priest for the occasion, but they seem to have been of a general nature and not for special benefits nor great ones.

Sacrifice was like a payment made in advance for stipulated favours, the price of which was to be fixed by the suppliant, but the favour might be withheld by the other because he did not consider the payment adequate. Then the disappointed human contracting party, who had spent his wealth and his prayers for nought, felt that he had a just cause for complaint against the god for not completing the transaction. Thus the old nurse rails against Zeus for not restoring Odysseus to his home, but suffered him to be a mock of women and dogs, although he had surpassed all men in the magnitude of his offerings. Thus, too, Achilleus, after the death of Patroklos, rebukes the river god, unto whom Peleus, his father, had dedicated a hecatomb and fifty sheep for the safe return of his son, and realizes that the prayers and the offerings had been in vain, for the god heeded them not. He absolves himself from his vow, shears his locks, and apparently renounces the deity that could deal so treacherously with the old man's supplications and make no return for such sumptuous sacrifices.

Σπερχεῖ', ἄλλως σοίγε πατὴρ ἠρήσατο Πηλεύς,
κεῖσέ με νοστήσαντα φίλην ἐς πατρίδα γαῖαν
σοί τε κόμην κερέειν ῥέξειν θ' ἱερὴν ἑκατόμβην,
πεντήκοντα δ' ἔνορχα παρ' αὐτόθι μῆλ' ἱερεύσειν
ἐς πηγὰς, ὅθι τοι τέμενος βωμός τε θυήεις.
ὣς ἠρᾶθ' ὁ γέρων, σὺ δέ οἱ νόον οὐκ ἐτέλεσσας.
νῦν δ' ἐπεὶ οὐ νέομαί γε φίλην ἐς πατρίδα γαῖαν,
Πατρόκλῳ ἥρωϊ κόμην ὀπάσαιμι φέρεσθαι.

Il. xxiii. 144-51.

Futile prayers and unavailing sacrifices challenge an explanation. They touch the soul of the religious life. Those who rebuked the gods did it in the mortification of disappointment, and disclosed thereby their fundamental belief; but another explanation was needed for the more sober moments of life, and for application to other people. Then it was asserted that sacrifices were the right of the gods demanded from their mortal dependents irrespective of any recompense, which, if bestowed, was an act of grace.

τὸ γὰρ λάχομεν γέρας ἡμεῖς. *Il.* iv. 49.

When Teukros and Meriones have the shooting match with the wild pigeon as a mark Teukros dedicated no sacrifice to Apollo, and the offended god caused him to miss the bird and to cut the cord that held it. Meriones vowed to him a glorious hecatomb of firstlings of the flock, and the god sped the aim so that the archer achieved the wonderful feat of bringing down the bird in full flight in the clouds. There is a similar incident in the chariot race. Eumelos meets with an accident, brought about by the action of Artemis, the poet says, who broke his yoke, so that he was flung to the ground and injured. He ought before the race to have made his vows to the gods, and then he would not have come in last, says his successful rival, who presumably was conscious of the efficacy of his own prayers.

> . . . ἀλλ' ὄφελεν ἀθανάτοισιν
> εὔχεσθαι· τό κεν οὔτι πανύστατος ἦλθε διώκων.
>
> *Il.* xxiii. 546-7.

It is Artemis who is angry with Oineus, because he had neglected her in his sacrifices, and she sent against him a wild boar, which laid waste his fields while living, and when dead engendered a battle for its head and shaggy hide.

These explanations of failure are devised by the onlooker, who probably finds them comforting to his own religious rectitude. The consciousness of superior merit usually makes men censorious. Their own failure is in consequence of the unjustifiable animosity of the gods: their neighbour's failure is according to his deserts: then are the gods wise in judgement.

The request is never for anything but material gain. The suppliant is hardly conscious of his need of moral gifts, nor that the gods bestow them, if he needed them. They are the fountains of power, of victory, of retribution, and of revenge; but not of the virtues. Their reputation would hardly give sanction to such a creed.

The voice of adoration and praise never passes the lips of men. It is difficult to see how it could. Does one laud and magnify the merchant with whom he trades? He

says he has received what he paid for; the other is paid for what he gave; the transaction is complete, nothing more is required. The Hebrew prophet in the temple at Jerusalem heard within his spirit the awful words of the trisagion: "Holy, holy, holy." In time he was probably not long after the Homeric poems, perhaps even earlier than their completion, but no temple at Athens, Dodona, or Elis could resound with such words, nor would any who trod those courts be able to hear them.

The worship of the Hebrews at their altars was formal, and therein like that of the Greeks, but there were men declaring that Jahveh delighted not in the blood of bullocks, loathed their feast-days, and that the multitude of their sacrifices would not avert the fall of his judgements. No Homeric hero or prophet caught even a glimpse of such august communion of the soul with its creator.

Once only there are spoken words which sound to the ear like those of a spiritual prophet. Achilleus makes answer to Athene, when she bids him contend against Agamemnon with nothing more serious than words:

> ὅς κε θεοῖς ἐπιπείθηται, μάλα τ' ἔκλυον αὐτοῦ.
>
> *Il.* i. 218.

It suggests the words of Samuel to king Saul: "To obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams." The incident belongs to the tenth century B.C., but it is impossible to disentangle the documents and to distinguish the original parts from the redactions. Probably this part is ancient. The differences between the two utterances are striking. The Greek is to obey because of the recompense. He had received a rich promise: he was not to risk losing it.

> ὧδε γὰρ ἐξερέω, τὸ δὲ καὶ τετελεσμένον ἔσται·
> καί ποτέ τοι τρὶς τόσσα παρέσσεται ἀγλαὰ δῶρα
> ὕβριος εἵνεκα τῆσδε· σὺ δ' ἴσχεο, πείθεο δ' ἡμῖν.
>
> *Il.* i. 212-14.

The Jewish king was to give the supremacy to obedience, and to learn that it was vain to suppose that sacrifice could

avert the penalties of transgression. Though in one or two aspects the religious principles of the two peoples were similar in their earlier periods, in the conception of prayer and sacrifice the divergence soon became manifest. The one was clinging to the material elements long after the other had arrayed itself in spiritual robes.

It is a remarkable tribute to the sovereignty of the Homeric poems over the mind of Greece that both the noble and the ignoble, the good and the inferior, are seized upon by succeeding generations and enlarged. Beneath his sway men journey to loftier heights, whence they can behold more splendid gods than he beheld and offer unto them a purer adoration ; they also sink into lower deeps, and then plead him as their authority for their self-degradation and for the dishonouring of their gods. His poems are the sacred scriptures of Greece.

When Sokrates seeks to impart a purer conception of prayer and its attendant rites of sacrifice he is opposed by the champions of Homeric orthodoxy. He is compelled to wage a war against Homer as much as against his contemporaries. The recurrence of the topic in the dialogues of Plato indicates the importance of the subject in the judgement of both master and disciple. The argument is consistently directed against the practice and beliefs set forth in the *Odyssey* and the *Iliad*.

Euthyphron is the typical man of the Homeric orthodoxy, and in the dialogue bearing his name religious beliefs are denounced as εὐπορία—mere chaffering. The self-confident young man is led against his will to confess that righteousness, τὸ ὅσιον, is τὸ τοῖς θεοῖς φίλον. (xiv E., xv B.).

In the *Laws* that kind of religion is more severely represented as a division of the spoil, so that a man, by dividing it with the gods, may retain a portion of it for himself, as though the wolves were allowed to rend the flocks at their pleasure by giving part of their prey to the watchdogs (*Laws*, 906 D.).

The *Second Alcibiades* is not Platonic, but it is very near the Platonic circle, and in it Homer is quoted as saying :

ἔρδειν ἀθανάτοισι τελησσας ἑκατόμβας·

τὴν δὲ κνίσσαν ἐκ τοῦ πεδίου τοὺς ἀνέμους φέρειν

οὐρανὸν εἴσω,
ἡδεῖαν· τῆς δ' οὔ τι θεοὺς μάκαρας δατέεσθαι,
οὐδ' ἐθέλειν· μάλα γάρ σφιν ἀπήχθετο Ἴλιος ἱρὴ
καὶ Πρίαμος . . .

149 D.

The conclusion ascribed to Sokrates is that the gods are not beguiled, as though they were greedy money-lenders:

οὐ γάρ, οἶμαι, τοιοῦτόν ἐστι τὸ τῶν θεῶν, ὥστε ὑπὸ δώρων παράγεσθαι οἷον κακὸν τοκιστήν.

The constructive theology of Sokrates on the subject is stated in the *Memorabilia*. It is not the amplitude of the offering that gains the favour of the god, but the character of the suppliant (*Mem.*, i, 3, 3). This is in accord with the prayer of the Lacedæmonian poet, beautiful in its greatness:

Ζεῦ βασιλεῦ, τὰ μὲν ἐσθλά, καὶ εὐχομένοις καὶ ἀνεύκτοις ἄμμι δίδου, τὰ δὲ δεινὰ καὶ εὐχομένοις ἀπαλέξειν.

2 *Alc.* 143 A.

The domination of Homer over the minds of the people was too mighty for the moral philosopher. He waged his conflict in vain. His reasoning was irresistible, but the victories of reason over prejudice, convention, and an easy formalism are ever slow. Those who willed not to follow him to his spiritual heights had Homer as their authority and their own inclinations as their incentive. The greatness of the poet gave permanence to his teachings, and the people, content with the lesser, brought the lesser into greater prominence.

Sacrifice and prayer become the more commercial. A later satirist mockingly gives a scale of payments for favours from the gods: so much for a prosperous journey, so much more for a successful enterprise, and still so much more for winning the hand of a princess; but not many men, he adds, can afford the cost of the latter.

Many illustrious leaders and some of the people sought

refuge in atheism. If the gods were parties to such spiritual huckstering they were no gods at all. It were better for a man to worship the sun and moon and the elements, for they could not be guilty of it; or let him fix his mind upon himself and say:

ἦθος ἀνθρώπῳ δαίμων. Herakl. *Fr.* 121.

He can at least hold converse with himself, which is better worth while than with such deities: to pray to them is but prattling to stones.

καὶ τοῖς ἀγάλμασι τουτέοισι εὔχονται, ὁκοῖον εἴ τις τοῖς δόμοισι λεσχηνεύοιτο, οὔ τι γινώσκων θεοὺς οὐδ' ἥρωας, οἵτινές εἰσι.

Herakl. *Fr.* 126.

Chapter XII. Homer: Men and Men

A MAN'S religious faith determines his attitude towards the gods of his worship, and then towards his fellows with whom he worships. What he does at the side of the altar governs what he does in the home, the market, and the city. Morals are crystallized worship, from which they derive their form and their lustre, their clarity or their tarnish.

Homer was not able to expunge all the legends of the gods; they were too deeply interwoven into the texture of life, but he made his heroes ignore them. The gods were not to be examples for their imitation; their world was not to be a mortal Olympus. Once only in the whole of the two books are the gods cited as a moral example for men.

> . . . στρεπτοὶ δέ τε καὶ θεοὶ αὐτοί, *Il.* ix. 497.

says Phoinix in his appeal to Achilleus to relent. The moral guides of men are not amongst the celestials at all.

Two divinities, says Hesiod, have their native dwelling-place amongst men—Αἰδώς and Νέμεσις. They are the defence of men against iniquity. As long as they abide on the earth there is hope for men, but none when they are gone. Only when wickedness has wrought its perfect work do they abandon their human sphere for the Olympian, from which they had been absentees, and then the cup of man's misery is full, nor is there any remedy for his unendurable woes.

> καὶ τότε δὴ πρὸς Ὄλυμπον ἀπὸ χθονὸς εὐρυοδείης
> λευκοῖσιν φαρέεσσι καλυψαμένω χρόα καλὸν
> ἀθανάτων μετὰ φῦλον ἴτην προλιπόντ' ἀνθρώπους
> Αἰδὼς καὶ Νέμεσις· τὰ δὲ λείψεται ἄλγεα λυγρὰ
> θνητοῖς ἀνθρώποισι· κακοῦ δ' οὐκ ἔσσεται ἀλκή.
>
> O. D. 195-9.

As Homer gave a kingdom to the Olympians, so he crowned Αἰδώς and Νέμεσις with honour and majesty. His heroes paid to them the homage of the soul. Together they represented what to-day would be called the individual conscience of the man and the collective con-

science of the community. They had neither sacrifices nor temples, but the ritual of their worship was the noblest man has ever been able to frame : integrity of character, honourable conduct, and upright dealing.

These unseen and austere divinities made the Homeric hero the man he was. Zeus might fill with plenty the storehouses of the king that feared him and enrich his subjects with prosperity (*Od.* xix, 109, 114). These divinities had more estimable rewards to bestow upon those who honoured them. They made Homer's men the men to possess as one's friends, to be one's host in the days of peace and one's comrade in the days of battle. Their word was as their oath : honour was the insignia of their life, conspicuous as the crest upon their helmet. They were men to live with, either in the tent or home.

In war they were fearless and valiant : it was a soldier's duty—a matter of conscience—that he should be so.

> *ὦ φίλοι, ἀνέρες ἔστε, καὶ αἰδῶ θέσθ' ἐνὶ θυμῷ,*
> *ἀλλήλους τ' αἰδεῖσθε κατὰ κρατερὰς ὑσμίνας.*
>
> *Il.* xv. 561-2.

The manifestation of *αἰδώς* was the demonstration of his heroism.

> *αἰδὼς, Ἀργεῖοι, κοῦροι νέοι . . .*
> *ὑμεῖς δ' οὐκέτι καλὰ μεθίετε θούριδος ἀλκῆς*
> *πάντες ἄριστοι ἐόντες ἀνὰ στρατόν. . . .*
> *. . . ἀλλ' ἐν φρεσὶ θέσθε ἕκαστος*
> *αἰδῶ καὶ νέμεσιν.*
>
> *Il.* xiii. 95, 116, 117, 121, 122.

So the Earth-Shaker pricked the hearts of those who were like to give way. There was no resisting such an appeal to conscience : it would turn to them with a look of unendurable shame. Only noble souls could feel like that : the appeal would have no force with conscienceless cowards.

The Homeric soldier took into battle what was the master emotion of his private life. *Αἰδώς* governed it. The people with whom chiefly he had to do—his king, his friend, the aged, the stranger, and the beggar at his

door—were all objects of deeds whose foundation lay in the conscience: they were *αἰδοῖοι*: the first because of the relationship between monarch and subject, the rest because of their helplessness. A man's friend was in his power because he has trusted him; the others because they are friendless and need him. The old man has survived his comrades, and in his feebleness has no one to stand for him against his enemies; the stranger is separated from his people; the beggar is what he is, because those who ought to have been his protectors were either too weak in the hour when trial came or they faithlessly abandoned him. He therefore had his claim upon every noble heart, as though his supplications were a behest from god.

> *ἀλλ' αἰδεῖο, φέριστε, θεούς· ἱκέται δέ τοί εἰμεν·*
> *Ζεὺς δ' ἐπιτιμήτωρ ἱκετάων τε ξείνων τε,*
> *ξείνιος, ὃς ξείνοισιν ἅμ' αἰδοίοισιν ὀπηδεῖ.*
>
> *Od.* ix. 269-71.

If the claims of Αἰδώς were ignored, then there would be Νέμεσις: the conscience of the community would accuse the offender; the common conscience would speak the condemnation the individual conscience had failed to make audible.

Achilleus is the supreme type of the Homeric hero; Αἰδώς is in his heart; he honours Νέμεσις. They are the fountain of his courage, of his just wrath, and of his relenting. Odysseus occupies a larger space in the poems, but he is too much like Zeus to be the hero *par excellence*, *sans reproche*. The god is *μητιέτης*, the man is *πολύμητις*. Conscience does not belong to the god any more than Αἰδώς dwells in Olympus: the man suppresses it.

In the *Iliad*, where he is amongst his comrades, he holds a subordinate position: he is first only when he is alone. He excels in ingenious scheming, in craftiness, and he wins his successes by circuitous subterfuges. His homage to Αἰδώς and Νέμεσις is inconstant. He receives but little esteem in later literature. He is brought on the stage when there is guileful talking to be done, or some crafty deed to be instigated.

Achilleus hardly appears at all. Arktinos of Miletus, *circa* 776 B.C., wrote the *Aithopis*, in five books, continuing the Homeric epic from the death of Hektor, in which he was the hero and of noble stature. Aischylos put a trilogy upon the stage of which he was the central figure. The single important, surviving reference to him in the tragic poets is in the *Iphigeneia in Aulide*, where Agamemnon endeavours to use him in his ruse to secure his daughter from Klytaimnestra for the purpose of sacrificing her to Artemis. Achilleus breaks the snare laid for him by resisting the king ; declaring chivalrously that he will defend the daughter with his sword, even when his own soldiers, led by Odysseus, are in arms against him. His character in this play, says Mahaffy, "approaches nearest of all the Greek tragic characters to that of a modern gentleman" (*History of Greek Literature*, i, 370). Euripides and Homer saw his greatness with the same eyes. With his sword and with his life he does honour to Αἰδώς. Odysseus has his reputation, but without exaltation : Achilleus has an exaltation to which deference is paid by silence. A man may be too complete in all his parts for representation upon the stage.

The character of the moral world created by the mind of Homer is displayed as definitely by the elements in the ancient life of Greece which he eliminates by silence as by the deeds he describes. What is morally repulsive and ugly is not suffered, for the most part, to rise out of its darkness. It is the creature of another world, and Homer's sceptre will not permit it to cross the frontiers of the world where he reigns.

The ancient world—Shemitic and Hellenic—was saturated with an especially repugnant form of vice. Each nation condemned it, practised it, and extenuated itself in the customary manner by ascribing its introduction to the people of another country. The Jew traced it to the Cities of the Plain, and preserved the legend of the retribution that followed its practice, but continued to tolerate it. The Greek traced its origin from across the sea.

τοῦ παιδεραστεῖν παρὰ πρώτων Κρητῶν εἰς τοὺς Ἕλληνας παρελθόντος, ὡς ἱστορεῖ Τίμαιος.
Athen. *Deipno.* xiii. 79 (602).

The same gossiping writer bears witness to the prevalence of the vice in Greece (*vide* Index, "puerorum amor"). Other nations, he says,

περὶ τὰ παιδικὰ δαιμονίως ἐπτόηνται. xiii. 77.

But the infatuation was not more demoniacal than in both the luxury and poverty of Greece.

Homer knew nothing of it. He has two separate lines about Ganymedes (*Il.* v 266 and *Il.* xx 232). He is the most handsome of mortals, who is translated to the immortals that he might be cupbearer to Zeus; that is all.

Later writers preserve traditions about Niobe's children, and of the character of the friendship between Achilleus and Patroklos.

οὕτω δ' ἐναγώνιος ἦν ἡ περὶ τὰ ἐρωτικὰ πραγματεία, καὶ οὐδεὶς ἡγεῖτο φορτικοὺς τοὺς ἐρωτικούς, ὥστε καὶ Αἰσχύλος, μέγας ὢν ποιητής, καὶ Σοφοκλῆς, ἦγον εἰς τὰ θέατρα διὰ τῶν τραγῳδιῶν τοὺς ἔρωτας, ὁ μὲν τὸν Ἀχιλλέως πρὸς Πάτροκλον, ὁ δ' ἐν τῇ Νιόβῃ τὸν τῶν παίδων· διὸ καὶ παιδεραστάν τινες καλοῦσι τὴν τραγῳδίαν· καὶ ἐδέχοντο τὰ τοιαῦτα ἄσματα οἱ θεαταί. Athen. *Deipno.* xiii. 75.

Homer makes the two soldiers like David and Jonathan. "The soul of Jonathan was knit with the soul of David, and Jonathan loved him as his own soul." David's lament over his dead friend is not more elevated than the lamentation of the Greek soldier: "I am distressed for thee, my brother Jonathan: very pleasant hast thou been unto me; thy love to me was wonderful, passing the love of women." Homer does not deny the unseemly suggestions: he puts something better in their place, with which they cannot live side by side.

A similar procedure is adopted in regard to Hermes. Before Homer he was merely an ἀγαθὸς δαίμων, and the ithyphallic stone was his symbol, placed at boundaries,

to shed his fertilizing gifts upon the fields it guarded. Subsequently it took a form still more obscene. Homer banishes the indecency of it all, and transforms him into a youth of grace, the bearer of the messages of the gods and the leader of the dead into the Under World. The achievement was no easy one, yet not of greater difficulty than others he wrought of a similar nature. He purifies what he touches. It was his genius that could make his hearers forget for a time their unseemly legends and the very facts that confronted them as often as they went outside their doors. It was he, says Pausanias, who promulgated the new conception of the servant of the gods, whose native rank was nothing more than an offensive, Pelasgic sex-symbol.

The absence of the wild orgies of the soldiers' lust after the battle, and of their lewd conversation in camp, are further significant indications of the moral attitude of the Homeric poems. The common soldier is sometimes heard amongst the conversations of his chieftains: the most innocent might have listened to him without shame. The one indecorous scene, which stands in solitude, is located not on earth, but in the mansions of the gods. The night after a battle round the walls of Troy has nothing to compare with it.

Homer's men in many respects are better than the gods. Αἰδώς walks the earth, even when men fight; nor does she gather her white robes to depart when the victor raises his shout. She speaks to the brute within man that war unchains, and tames it into order. The suggested explanation of the behaviour of the soldiers, namely, that they were under a vow, like David's company (I Samuel, xxi, 4), wherefore they wear their hair unshorn, κάρη κομόωντες, does not meet all the circumstances: it does not explain the reserve of their language. The conversation and the conduct go together.

Women become subject to the victors: sad is their lot, as weeping Andromache knows, but neither she, attractive as she is, πολύδωρος, λευκώλενος, nor her female attendants were degraded in brutish shame. The daughter of Briseus and the daughter of Chryses are both amongst

the captives: the one falls to the chief of the heroes and the other to the king. Liberty is gone, but according to the standard both of those times and of later ages they were not dishonoured. The vase painter of an amphora in the British Museum represents Briseis with a flagon in her right hand and a paten in her left; she serves, but her countenance is erect, free, and unabashed. The artist was a just interpreter.

Fighting in the Homeric wars was clean: the fighters observed the laws of honour. Poisoned weapons are dishonourable; they are treacherous, and they aid the coward. They were not unknown in Greece. The common word for poison bears on its face its kinship with the arrow of war—*τοξικόν, τὰ τόξα.*

There was no shame about the thing. What were those arrows that Herakles carried, as Hesiod describes them:

> *. . . πολλοὶ δ' ἔντοσθεν οἰϊστοὶ*
> *ῥιγηλοὶ, θανάτοιο λαθιφθόγγοιο δοτῆρες.*
> *πρόσθεν μὲν θάνατόν τ' εἶχον καὶ δάκρυσι μῦρον.*
>
> *Aspis.* 130-2.

They had been dipped in the gall of the Hydra, and a scratch from one of them was enough to engender a noisome sore that could infect the camp, and curable only by Asklepios. Homer has but one definite reference to the practice, and that cannot be construed into a recognition of its prevalence amongst the men of his battles.

Pallas Athene appears to Telemachos in the guise of a stranger—Mentes, ruler over the Taphioi—and explains her knowledge of Odysseus by inventing a story that he had received from her fictitious father the deadly unguent for his arrow-heads.

> *ᾤχετο γὰρ καὶ κεῖσε θοῆς ἐπὶ νηὸς Ὀδυσσεὺς*
> *φάρμακον ἀνδροφόνον διζήμενος, ὄφρα οἱ εἴη*
> *ἰοὺς χρίεσθαι χαλκήρεας· ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν οὔ οἱ*
> *δῶκεν, ἐπεί ῥα θεοὺς νεμεσίζετο αἰὲν ἐόντας,*
> *ἀλλὰ πατήρ οἱ δῶκεν ἐμός· φιλέεσκε γὰρ αἰνῶς.*
>
> *Od.* i. 260-4.

The story is contradictory: the goddess speaks like a poor mortal who is not apt at inventions. Her father would not give the drug because it was not the kind of thing a man who feared the gods would do, but he gave it because he loved his friend desperately. It is a fabrication such as πολύβουλος Ἀθήνη would devise. Homer does not suggest that Odysseus used the poison; but Telemachos is not shocked at the assigned reason: it explained the friendship; he apparently understood about smearing arrows with man-killing drugs.

Arrows were sufficiently deadly without such treatment: they would contract quite enough contamination to infect a wound by being carried point downwards, as they were, in the quiver. It would be a painful piece of surgery, and perhaps dangerous, to extract the barbs, some of which stood a chance of being broken in the flesh while being withdrawn even by the skilful Machaon. Such arrows deserved to be called πικροὶ οἰστοί, βέλεα στονοέντα. Agamemnon might well shudder when he saw his brother Menelaos struck by one of them and the black blood begin to flow: Menelaos might well faint when he felt it, though it touched no vital part; hope soon came back when he saw that all the barbs had not gone in.

> ῥίγησεν δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς ἀρηΐφιλος Μενέλαος·
> ὡς δὲ ἴδεν νεῦρόν τε καὶ ὄγκους ἐκτὸς ἐόντας,
> ἄψορρόν οἱ θυμὸς ἐνὶ στήθεσσιν ἀγέρθη.
>
> *Il.* iv. 150-2.

People might repeat the story that Herakles used the devices of barbarism: Homer will not recognize that any of his heroes do; they are chivalrous fighters, men who are brave whether they win or fall. Poison on an arrow-tip, or in a cup, is foul play. There is much fighting to be done in the world he creates, but it shall be done honourably.

Another notable feature of the Homeric poems is the absence of the torture of prisoners of battle and of the mutilation of the slain. In the wars for commercial routes and the possession of fresh lands, of which the *Iliad* is a

surviving record, there must have been plenty of both. The nations were still barbaric, both in their splendour and in their wars. There is much fighting in the *Iliad*, but the men know how to honour their opponents when conquered as well as on the field of battle. That is how Greeks ought to fight.

A coward who would flee from a live dog could hack a dead lion: it was as much as he could do. Homer's men are to face the lion in his strength: they have no heart to take petty vengeance on him when he can no longer withstand them.

Under stress of anger or sorrow the primitive passions break out. Men are human, and are not redeemed without blemish from the vices of their age, but they recognize them as vices. Ajax cuts off the head of the slain Imbrios and hurls it like a ball to the feet of Hektor, but that was when his wrath and grief were hot for the death of the brave Amphimakos (*Il.* xiii, 169-205).

In later periods there were several instances of the outbreak of barbaric atavism. The Spartans put about two hundred prisoners to death whom they had taken at Platæa; Lysandros put three thousand to death after the battle of Ægospotami; and Athens had about a thousand of the conquered Mityleneans executed. Fierce as these deeds were they are not to be regarded as the normal issue of battles. There was much fighting, but it did not always end like that. Even at the battle of Platæa there is the manifestation of a more worthy spirit. The proposal is made to the Spartan king, Pausanias, to visit upon the dead body of Mardonios the outrage Xerxes had inflicted upon Leonidas at Thermopylæ. He rejects the proposal with a sharp rebuke and a threat against the man who made it, and the narrator manifestly has a cordial approval of his conduct (*Hdt.* ix, 78-79). Pausanias had refused to act κατὰ τὸ πάτριον ἔθος, as his namesake, the historian, calls it, and was therefore worthy of encomium. The warriors in the *Iliad* are always making the great refusal, but the poet does not praise them for it: they were acting as they ought to act. Their action becomes the ideal for the magnanimous soldier.

Achilleus provides an illustration of the new spirit at its best and of the old spirit at its worst. He fought against Thebe, in Troas, the story says, and slew Eetion, its king.

> . . . . κατὰ δ' ἔκτανεν Ἠετίωνα,
> οὐδέ μιν ἐξενάριξε, σεβάσσατο γὰρ τόγε θυμῷ,
> ἀλλ' ἄρα μιν κατέκηε σὺν ἔντεσι δαιδαλέοισιν
> ἠδ' ἐπὶ σῆμ' ἔχεεν. περὶ δὲ πτελέας ἐφύτευσαν
> νύμφαι ὀρεστιάδες, κοῦραι Διὸς αἰγιόχοιο.
>
> *Il.* vi. 416-20.

That was the way an opponent ought to be treated; buried with all his honours. The gleaming armour was the spoil of the victor: no one could have complained had he stripped the corpse and left it, unburied, to the dogs. Achilleus, when he was his normal self, feels too much reverence to do either.

There is a twofold tradition about the death of Hektor. One was that he was still alive when Achilleus tied him to his chariot. Sophokles, with his love for antiquity, accepts it.

> ζωστῆρι πρισθεὶς ἱππικῶν ἐξ ἀντύγων
> ἐκνάπτετ' αἰὲν, ἕς τ' ἀπέψυξεν βίον.
>
> *Ajax* 1030-1.

Euripides accepts the same version:

> ἥτις σφαγὰς μὲν Ἕκτορος τροχηλάτους
> κατεῖδον . . *Andr.* 399.

Such barbaric cruelty is repugnant to Homer: he states with reiterated emphasis that he was dead first. Even then it is bad. There is the unusual feature of a moral censure upon the deed and the incidents connected with it. They were ἀεικέα ἔργα; they were discreditable.

The sacrifice of the Trojan prisoners upon the funeral pyre of Patroklos was, perchance, too prominent in the traditions to be completely ignored: it is frigidly condensed into eight words—fewer than the description of the carving of a chine at a meal—and again there is moral condemnation: κακὰ δὲ φρεσὶ μήδετο ἔργα. It was no credit to a man.

Our sympathies are with Achilleus. We share the grief, insatiable of tears, that maddened his soul and by its intensity kept him sleepless and hungry for more than a week (*Il.* xxiv, 1-21). He had received the supernatural assurance that his own death would speedily follow upon his revenge.

> ὠκύμορος δή μοι, τέκος, ἔσσεαι, οἷ' ἀγορεύεις·
> αὐτίκα γάρ τοι ἔπειτα μεθ' Ἕκτορα πότμος ἑτοῖμος.
>
> *Il.* xviii, 95-96.

He is laying his own life upon the flames that consume the bodies of his enemies as an offering in honour of his comrade in arms. There were extenuations and palliations, but no justification. The hero had his faults, but they are honestly recognized as faults.

The soldier that read the story could take his spear and shield into battle feeling it was a noble duty to emulate the courage of Achilleus and to win renown, but there was no honour in the slaughter of unarmed prisoners who had fallen to his prowess. To him, also, would come that noon, or dawn, or eve, when the shaft of death would lay him low :

> ἔσσεται ἢ ἠὼς ἢ δείλη ἢ μέσον ἦμαρ—
> ὁππότε τις καὶ ἐμεῖο Ἄρει ἐκ θυμὸν ἕληται,
> ἢ ὅγε δουρὶ βαλὼν, ἢ ἀπὸ νευρῆφιν ὀϊστῷ.
>
> *Il.* xxi, 111-13.

Friendly hands would erect over him a soldier's tomb, and then would be heard the whispered comment, stinging even in the grave, κακὰ δὲ φρεσὶ μήδετο ἔργα. He slew the captives of his spear !

The execution of the maidservants in the household of Odysseus was a severe punishment; yet they merited death. They had been the partners in the lust and the insolence of the suitors. Their common crimes and vices sent them together to Hades.

Melanthios, the goatherd, is a true brother to the shameless wanton, Melantho. He is insolent and base. At the critical moment of the struggle he betrays the arms of Odysseus to the suitors, which seemed like to be his undoing :

καὶ τότ' Ὀδυσσῆος λύτο γούνατα καὶ φίλον ἦτορ,
ὡς περιβαλλομένους ἴδε τεύχεα χερσί τε δοῦρα
μακρὰ τινάσσοντας· μέγα δ' αὐτῷ φαίνετο ἔργον.
Od. xxii, 147-9.

The treatment meted out to him is cruel: we wish it had been less or more; less mutilation or more, the stroke that carried death. He no less than the others had earned a common fate.

The scene in the house of Odysseus after the fight moves one with horror. The home had become a battlefield, its floor a shambles. The intellectual and moral genius of the poet redeems it all by a single line, which flames in the eyes of men for all time:

οὐχ ὁσίη κταμένοισιν ἐπ' ἀνδράσιν εὐχετάασθαι.
Od. xxii. 412.

The banqueting hall, where the arrows sped and men lay groaning in their death agony, was a hall of judgement. The gods from their throne had pronounced a just decree, and the hands of the man who had been wronged executed it. The scene of justice is not the place of shouting as in the day of triumph: it is too august for that. An excitable woman might feel like doing it, but not a right feeling man; least of all the man whose hands had been the ministers of divine and human Nemesis.

The sight of slain men is always awful, even of criminals; death is awesome. A brave man knows that: he has looked into its eyes so often. To begin home life again after years of battles and wanderings, to rejoin a loyal wife, and a son who had attained a magnanimous manhood, was an ecstatic felicity that few men in all the generations of mankind experience. To enter upon that life with the blood of slaughter upon its threshold stifled the sound of laughter and the voice of joy.

The ringing word once spoken had the force of a moral law. The conscience alike of those who had won a victory and of those who enjoyed its benefits endorsed it. The tragic setting made it ring in the ears of the people. Victories were celebrated with triumphal celebrations,

but the mind was directed from the hosts of the slain to the material benefits that accrued. The harvest of death was the awful price of victory. Pity was taught to stretch her hand over the distant battlefield and the graves of friend and foe that marked it. The poet took his place amongst the great ones of the earth as a teacher of compassion.

Two chief elements of Homer's moral influence remain to be mentioned. One was his silent condemnation of the abominations of human sacrifice. The example of Achilleus could not be cited in its favour. It was condemned. With all its palliations it was a stain upon the hero's renown. The legends were full of the practice. Custom approved it; religion gave to it her austere sanction. The fighters around Troy, but for that single exception, ignore it. All the voices that come out of the past are insufficient to constrain them.

The hideous custom might continue to lurk in dark corners, or come into a festival, driven by some dynamic, but from the night following a battle between Greeks and Trojans it was silently expelled. The maw of death had been more than filled. Neither the gods of Olympus nor the gods of Hades demanded more victims. The altars erected on the field of battle were no longer to be desecrated with the blood of men.

It is difficult to trace the effect of a spiritual influence; but one thing is certain: battles became more humane than before. The heroes of the Greek race had severed the traditions of the abomination. So the poet taught, and the world at war hearkened to his voice.

The other notable element was the banishment of the conception of the man-god. Men traced their descent on one side or the other to the immortals. Homer does not contradict them. Agamemnon is the grandson of Tantalos, who is the son of Zeus; Achilleus is the son of the Nereid, Thetis, and of Peleus, who is a grandson of Zeus. Homer has no uncertainty about them; but he makes the human lineage in the ascendant—the divine is sterile. It is conceivable that it was not without design that Homer made the king of the Greeks less in character and in prowess than some of the warriors in his train,

and that the conspicuous error of heart and feeling was committed by the one who is nearest in kinship to the immortals.

By the one he laid the axe at the root of the adoration of the monarch as divine, and by the other of the hero as divine. Each was a man, and no more. The esteem paid to them in their lifetime, and to their memory after they were dead, rested upon earthly foundations.

It was a superlative achievement: it cleared the way for the coming of Democracy, and drove from amongst men who were able to receive the teaching the degradation of confusing the earthly throne with the heavenly. The records of the divine king are always written in blood; the deification of the hero had contaminated religion.

The greatness of the achievement is measured by its difficulty. The most advanced races were slow to reject an ancient theory. Politicians and priests supported it as a facile means of imposing their will upon the populace. Superstition clung to it as an authoritative buttress for established prejudices and as a justification for the surrender of independent thinking. Habitual conservatism held it fast, because it had descended from remote antiquity. Nearly all the minds save the greatest accepted it, for all its degrading consequences, because it made them feel that they were governed by superhuman wisdom, and that in their national and in their individual life they were under the direction of a superhuman providence.

Oriental races are naturally servile: it is no surprise that they should sedulously maintain the object of their servility. Rome was not servile, yet it deified the Cæsars; England is not servile, yet down to the age of the Stuarts the remnants of the morbid growth were cleaving to its royalty. There was the "right divine of kings to govern wrong."

The Hellenic spirit embodied in the Homeric poems gave the direction to the world's progress and enabled it to see manhood clearly and greatly. It removed a false, distorting light from the eyes of men. It directed the mind

from fictitious to veritable worth, from position to character. A man must justify his kingship by his merits, his claim to heroic rank by heroic deeds. Slowly, indeed, has the world mastered the lesson, many a time it has lost it; but from the height where the achievement is finally won it can look back and in the dim past see the solitary figure of the Greek poet pointing to the place whither, with many a conflict and by a path marked by many a sacrifice, it has won its way.

Chapter XIII. Homer: Eschatology

RELIGION deals with the life that now is; it also displays to the hopes of men the destiny of life in a deathless future. This is the common heritage of the race. Few tribes, even of the lowest mental and religious life, lack it. As far back in the centuries of time as the archæologist can trace the presence of man upon the earth, he sees him with his face turned toward an existence that is to be his possession when this present one is ended. His spear, his cup, a dish of food are found beside him where his body is buried, or burnt together with it in the flames. Immortality and the dread of extinction are innate, apparently, from the remote beginnings of human life.

> 'Tis heaven itself that points out an hereafter,
> And intimates eternity to man.

The interpretation of the hope varies in different ages and amongst different peoples. Emotion, intellectual development, and environment all make their contribution. Plato and the Hottentot cannot think of it in the same terms, neither can Homer and St. Paul. The matter of real interest is that they both think of the same thing, and with the most serious earnestness.

The present life projects both its shadows and its glimmering beams of light into the future. That life is largely the best ideal speculation can devise out of the material of the present.

The cloud of sadness, that never passed away from the sky of the Greek mind, assumes more definite proportions and larger magnitude in the world beyond, just as the radiant disposition of St. Paul expresses itself in the most ecstatic hopes. As those expectations of felicity in the mind of the Apostle derive their confidence from the presence of the deity in his earthly life who will be the fulness of his joy hereafter, so the gloomy sadness upon the mind of the Greek, developing out of his relationship with the gods, transfers itself into his future. He has an indictment to lay against the gods: they are not just

towards him. They inflict evil upon him, and then punish him for it. They heap afflictions upon him; they know nought of suffering, and care nought for his.

ὣς γὰρ ἐπεκλώσαντο θεοὶ δειλοῖσι βροτοῖσιν,
ζώειν ἀχνυμένοις. αὐτοὶ δέ τ' ἀκηδέες εἰσίν.

Il. xxiv, 525-6.

The best thing, therefore, that can befall the man upon his death is to escape beyond their sway. The realms he dreams of are ruled by Hades, the Lord of the Dead, who has nothing to do with him during the days of his life. He is "implacable, inflexible"; but he will be a change of masters. Like all gods, he is a jealous god, and admits no encroaching rival. The gods that rule the kingdoms of the upper air are not suffered to approach his. Zeus and the Olympians are the gods of the living; death is emancipation for their subjects.

It was a depressing future, but it was better than the alternative of a man entering into closer fellowship with the gods of his life. It was worse than being a slave's slave on earth:

βουλοίμην κ' ἐπάρουρος ἐὼν θητευέμεν ἄλλῳ,
ἀνδρὶ παρ' ἀκλήρῳ, ᾧ μὴ βίοτος πολὺς εἴη,
ἢ πᾶσιν νεκύεσσι καταφθιμένοισιν ἀνάσσειν.

Od. xi, 489-91.

But it was preferable to being to a fuller extent the sport of the gods he had known. Wherefore death was not a matter for a man to groan over:

. . . . τῷ μή τι θανὼν ἀκαχίζεν, Ἀχιλλεῦ.

Od. xi, 486.

The words derive much of their force from being spoken where they were, and by the lips of Odysseus. He knew those gods: he owed them little beyond his sufferings and his wanderings. He had come to visit the Under World, where he himself would dwell when death claimed him. He had experienced the one life and had seen the other; that was his judgement.

The kingdom of Hades is a spectral shadow of the realms of Zeus. Its subjects are shadows, who pursue a life of shadows of what once to them were substance. They have lost Zeus, Athene, and the rest; they have changed the sunshine of the Mediterranean for Under World gloom; but things are much the same. The colossal and shadowy form of Orion, still bearing a club, hunts its shadowy prey amongst the pastures of funereal asphodel.

χερσὶν ἔχων ῥόπαλον παγχάλκεον, αἰὲν ἀαγές.

Od. xi, 575.

Minos continues to be the lawgiver amongst the dead, and around him shades like himself go through the mockery of life.

ἔνθ' ἦτοι Μίνωα ἴδον, Διὸς ἀγλαὸν υἱόν,
χρύσεον σκῆπτρον ἔχοντα, θεμιστεύοντα νέκυσσιν,
ἥμενον· οἱ δέ μιν ἀμφὶ δίκας εἴροντο ἄνακτα,
ἥμενοι ἑσταότες τε κατ' εὐρυπυλὲς Ἄϊδος δῶ.

Od. xi. 568-71.

Herakles still carries his bow, and the arrow is upon the string; he walks like the darkness of night; he glares around; but the act begun is never completed: it is itself a shadow within a shadow.

There is but one kind of future life for all mortals; all share the same destiny. There is neither reward nor punishment. A man's works do not follow him, neither do his sins. A man is not more happy because he was righteous, nor less happy because his deeds were evil. The lot of the dead is the same: neither happiness nor unhappiness, neither recompense nor retribution enter into the matter. To this there are only two exceptions. The Erinys, "walking in darkness," ἠεροφοῖτις Ἐρινύς, has the special office of inflicting torment upon the perjurer, because it was what he called upon the gods to give to his forsworn soul.

Γῆ τε καὶ Ἥλιος καὶ Ἐρινύες, αἵθ' ὑπὸ γαῖαν
ἀνθρώπους τίνυνται, ὅτις κ' ἐπίορκον ὀμόσσῃ.

Il. xix. 259-60.

It was the kind of prayer they did not fail to answer. For somewhat similar reasons the sufferings of Tantalos, Sisyphos, and Tityos are punitive. They had each sinned directly against the gods, and the gods subject them to everlasting and ineffectual struggles.

There was no hope for those who abode in the realms of death. The inequalities of life were not readjusted. If a man suffer unjustly here, his sufferings, like the club of Orion and the bow of Herakles, will follow him there; if he found pleasure in easy vices, his pleasures, or the shadowy pursuit of them, still will be possible there, like the beasts Orion pursued over the mountains.

Such an expectation is no stimulus to virtue, nor any bridle upon evil. If a man pursue the good it must be solely for its own sake. His choice must be like that of Achilleus and Glaukos: he will be an illustrious example to the admiration of men, and will live briefly and gloriously rather than enjoy an easy length of unlaborious years:

> *νῦν δ'—ἔμπης γὰρ κῆρες ἐφεστᾶσιν θανάτοιο*
> *μυρίαι, ἃς οὐκ ἔστι φυγεῖν βροτὸν οὐδ' ὑπαλύξαι—*
> *ἴομεν, ἠέ τῳ εὖχος ὀρέξομεν, ἠέ τις ἡμῖν.*
>
> *Il.* xii, 326-8.

Life can be made noble by him who will; only the coward who has flung away the treasure of opportunity would lament:

> *πάντων μὲν μὴ φῦναι ἐπιχθονίοισιν ἄριστον,*
> *μηδ' ἐσιδεῖν αὐγὰς ὀξέος ἠελίου·*
> *φύντα δ', ὅπως ὤκιστα πύλας Ἀΐδαο περῆσαι,*
> *καὶ κεῖσθαι πολλὴν γῆν ἐπαμησάμενον.*
>
> *Theogn.* 425-8.

Duty and conscience call upon him to achieve the best that is in him. The way is steep, accessible only to the invincibly brave: their call to him is:

> *αἰὲν ἀριστεύειν καὶ ὑπείροχον ἔμμεναι ἄλλων,*
> *μηδὲ γένος πατέρων αἰσχυνέμεν, οἳ μέγ' ἄριστοι . . .*
>
> *Il.* vi, 208-9.

Interpreted in the home, the council chamber, and in the moral domain, it is a precept to shine like the sun in the life of a man.

Homer caught a fleeting glimpse of a future state which is not in the shadowland of Erebos. There are Elysian Fields somewhere, and happy realms, unto which some of the children of men shall finally arrive. Menelaos is the only one he records as entering into them, and then not by merit but through Olympian nepotism, which was as prevalent in those courts as anywhere upon earth.

Homer is as a man who sees through a mist; it remained for those who came after to give clearness and substance to the vision. Pindar can see the Islands of the Blessed and discern that those who dwell in them are the righteous ones of earth. Orphism gives still more a moral significance to the hope of a future of bliss: it shall be only for the pure and the holy, the *καθαροί* and the *ὅσιοι*.

The *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* speak the first lisping syllables of the all but universal language of mankind in making the after-life a continuation of this: the few lines about the Elysian Fields express the rising hope of men in pointing to habitations of bliss, prepared for some, at least, of the elect sons of mankind, where life's sorrows shall find their compensations. Later ages bring the hope into moral relationship with the life that led to its attainment. Homer directed the eyes thitherward.

The poet's conceptions are sometimes vague, but they were as clear as most people's to-day of the life of the soul hereafter. The artist is a man of more than ordinary intelligence, and sometimes he has occasion to give through the medium of his art a visible idea of the life beyond the grave represented by one of its possessors. Sometimes it is a bodyless head, with wings to cover the place of severance. That is symbolic; but of what? Its chief significance is that the artist has nothing more precise to offer. Sometimes he presents an angel from that land merely as a human being, having the same skeleton and muscular organization, with the addition of wings springing from the shoulders. As Ruskin says, the artist

never provides the wearer of them with the muscles to use them, and anyone can always tell whether he copied them from an eagle or a gannet.

Homer's thinking is quite as definite as St. Paul's, or as that disclosed in the *Apocalypse*. Full-orbed thought is impossible upon the nature of an existence of which we know nothing, continuing under conditions which are unimaginable, endowed with qualities which we have never experienced, and in a medium which is nothing but a name for the inconceivable.

The significant thing is that Homer felt the instinctive, human longing for immortality, and gave firm expression to it. Probably no other single doctrine has done more towards shaping the course of this present world. Men have suffered and laboured and counted their lives as nothing for the sake of a more abundant entrance into the life of their hopes. In the dawn of history—at the beginning of literature—a poet spoke their heart in a language that ruled the mind by its vivacity, its force, and its beauty. His utterances became the scriptures of the most versatile race under heaven. They anticipated the Jewish Scriptures in regard to the expectation of immortality. Sheol to the Jew was the place of oblivion and annihilation. "In death there is no remembrance of thee: in Sheol who shall give thee thanks?" (Psalm vi, 6). The date of the psalm, though late, is uncertain. The Proto-Isaiah, about 700 B.C., writes: "Sheol cannot praise thee; death cannot celebrate thee: they that go down into the pit cannot hope for thy truth" (Is. xxxviii, 18). The book of Ecclesiastes, which Dr. Ginsburg calls "the latest composition of the Old Testament," says: "The living know that they shall die; but the dead know not anything, neither have they any more a reward" (ix, 5). The writer gives the excellent advice, "Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might," but the reason for his advice is not that the strenuous life shall be rewarded in the future, but that the present is man's only opportunity; "for," says he, "there is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom in Sheol, whither thou goest" (ix, 10). When the vision did enter into

the soul of the Jew he filled it with his own moral and religious passion. It had a meaning for this present life : Lazarus and Dives could not have the same immortal destiny.

Later Greek writers amplified the Homeric Nekuiai, and filled the vision with gentler scenes. They were presented with two alternatives : either to accept Homer as the basis of their eschatology or to repudiate the doctrine. In the main they did the former, and the vision grew in definiteness and attractiveness of beauty till it reached its most perfect form in the pre-Christian era through the hopes and genius of Plato. Sokrates, standing at the entrance of the valley of death, can be represented as saying to his judges, who compel him before his appointed hour to walk therein :

> ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν ἀνδρὶ ἀγαθῷ κακὸν οὐδὲν οὔτε ζῶντι οὔτε τελευτήσαντι.

Chapter XIV. The Poet as Theologian—II. Hesiod

HERODOTUS, in his now famous passage, places Hesiod on an equality with Homer as a creator of Greek systematic theology. It is as though a man said Shakespeare and Congreve fixed the character of the English drama.

A writer cannot say everything, neither can he attach a qualification, like a wagon, to every fleet Pegasus of statement he directs across his pages. Readers are supposed to possess a measure of intelligence, often overrated, however, both by themselves and the writers. The early readers of the historian would be sufficiently imbued with the spirit of the times to know his standpoint, to fill up the silences, and to understand why the two poets are placed together on an apparent equality. We are less fortunately situated. We have not all the writings of the later poet, and what we know of his lost works does not lead us to suppose that they contained much theology, except perhaps the *Melampodia*, which told the story of Teiresias, Chalcas, and of Melampos, whose soothsaying and medicine brought him a princess as his wife, a kingdom, and his liberty. The subject might have taken Hesiod within sight of the values of mythology.

We can only surmise the forces at work upon and within the historian's mind. He might have regarded an explicit and formulated theology as more influential than one that was merely implicit and allusive, just as there are minds to-day that consider a formulated creed more potent than the informal articles of belief that abide in the mind unexpressed, but are always being translated into action. The method of the historian would indicate that he is of this type. Or he might have observed that the precise statements of the *Theogonia* were more frequently cited as proof texts of current theology than the descriptive passages of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, and were therefore of equal consequence at least.

We, with our experience of the evolution of religion, cannot accept the validity of either of these alternatives. A creed, great as its formative influence may be, is less effectual in developing opinion than the unformulated doctrines. The collects of the English Book of Common Prayer have done more towards moulding the current theology of the Anglican Church than the Apostles' Creed; a few notable verses of Scripture than a Catechism. The convictions create the creed more than the creed creates the convictions. The *Iliad* created the *Theogonia*. A creed is fixed, and therefore unprogressive. It cannot be the mother of succeeding generations of living belief. Its rigidity makes it the object of ceaseless attack: it has as much as it can do to maintain its position.

The frequency of current quotation is an uncertain guide to the influence of the writer. The *Elegy*, short as it is, has provided as many popular quotations as *Paradise Lost* and *Paradise Regained* combined; but Gray is not Milton, nor has he wielded the same influence upon the English-speaking races. A quotation depends upon its compendiousness; the methodical theological statements have that advantage over the discursive statements of Homer. They are waistcoat-pocket theology for slovenly thinkers. Nevertheless, they have but a subordinate influence in fashioning the mind.

Hesiod occupied a place of transition from an uncrystallized to a crystallized theology. Homer left many things vague; they did not come within the scope of his story. Kronos was the father of Zeus; but whence sprung Kronos? What was the descent of man from the first-born sons of the gods upon earth? Was woman of the same original birth as man? Whence originated this earth, and by whom? What was the story of creation? And many other things that the mind of man perpetually enquires after from the time it can form a question, and which remain unanswered even after the searchings of the acutest minds. They were not in Homer's horizon, either from the tent of Achilleus or the ship of Odysseus.

Hesiod endeavoured to give the record of beginnings, and in doing so hardened beliefs into dogma, sunlit

clouds into statues. The radiance was eliminated and many of the features coarsened ; subsequent generations, when called upon to accept them, were confronted with the alternative of believing either that their deities were bad, though they accepted them, or of rejecting them as unworthy of their position. Hesiod was the true father of Greek Scepticism. To use a similitude from his own mythology, he was the Kronos who begat the son that cast him down :

οὕνεκά οἱ πέπρωτο ἐῷ ὑπὸ παιδὶ δαμῆναι.
Theogon. 464.

He had the same legends to draw upon as Homer, but he was not endowed with the genius to sublimate the gold from the mud. It is surprising that members of an enlightened people should be willing to accept some of his stories : they are coarse and repulsive, and savour of the rustic, whose life is with his cattle. Snakes and bulls and owls may lead to something better, as the religious records of both Shemite and Aryan show. The creature is rejected, and its abstract quality of wisdom or power is idealized into a superhuman being. Such imaginings as Hesiod records mark the degeneration of religion, and are finally subversive of it.

The change in the religious atmosphere indicates that there must have been a longer time than is often allowed between the earlier and the later of the two epic poets. If the date of Hesiod is to be thrown back, then a corresponding change must be made in regard to Homer ; if the date of Homer be advanced the date of Hesiod must be also. It is impossible to accept a late date for Homer and an early date for Hesiod. Too many things had happened during the interval in the religious life of Greece.

The earlier poet was sufficiently remote in the background of history to be subject to revision without protest, and even to be defeated by his successor, if the tradition of the contest at the funeral games of Amphidamas of Chalcis can be accepted.

The passing away of an ancient opinion and the emergence of a new one are like the erosion of the rocks and

the deposition of fresh geologic strata ; they indicate the periods of time that must have elapsed. One thing men are now sure of—they do not come suddenly. Neither the world of matter nor the world of mind develops by cataclysmic transitions. A revised form of belief, a fresh religious conception, or a new outlook demands the creation of an environment suited to it before it can come into life. The legend of the birth of Athene in full maturity can never be more than a pretty myth, which no age in this world can ever realize.

The *Theogony* is the first memorial of the search of the Greek mind after a philosophic order of the universe. The world did not begin its career in the middle; what is had an antecedent ; Olympus, therefore, must have had its epochs and succession of events. Zeus is firmly established upon his throne, and his lightning flashes from the sky ; there are legends of his father and mother : whence came they, and their ancestry, if they had any ? What was the world like before it was his hand that held those lightnings ? And so on, as far back as thought can carry itself on its far-journeying pinions.

Hesiod co-ordinates contemporary sporadic traditions into a system, and produces the story of the creation of the universe and of its gods. He postulates a primeval Chaos, to which ensue Gaia and Eros.

> ἤτοι μὲν πρώτιστα Χάος γένετ', αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα
> Γαῖ' εὐρύστερνος, πάντων ἕδος ἀσφαλὲς αἰεὶ
> [ἀθανάτων, οἳ ἔχουσι κάρη νιφόεντος Ὀλύμπου]
> Τάρταρά τ' ἠερόεντα μυχῷ χθονὸς εὐρυοδείης,
> ἠδ' Ἔρος, ὃς κάλλιστος ἐν ἀθανάτοισι θεοῖσι.
>
> *Theogon.* 116-20.

The thought is obscure. The verb *γίγνομαι* is occasionally in Homer the equivalent to *εἶναι*, but the use of it in Hesiod in that sense is less certain. . . . It is almost certainly used here as the equivalent of *nasci* or *fieri* : the third line further on determines that.

> ἐκ Χάεος δ' Ἔρεβός τε μέλαινά τε Νὺξ ἐγένοντο.
>
> *Theogon.* 123.

Chaos had a beginning, but he cannot get back any further. The origin of Gaia and of Eros is equally obscure: they are merely ἔπειτα, though whence they entered into the succession he does not indicate. Chaos spontaneously generated Erebos and Nox, and from the latter come Aither and Hemere. Gaia produces Ouranos for the gods, and the sea and the mountains for their inhabitants. Then Ouranos becomes the spouse of Gaia, from which union come the Titans, the Kyklopes—

γείνατο δ' αὖ Κύκλωπας, ὑπέρβιον ἦτορ ἔχοντας.

139.

—and the three Giants—

τρεῖς παῖδες μεγάλοι καὶ ὄβριμοι, οὐκ ὀνομαστοί.

148.

After Ouranos comes Kronos, who ascends the throne by means of his iron sickle, made for him by his mother—Gaia. He imitates the policy of his sire in endeavouring to destroy his offspring, but with no better success: he, too, is dethroned by his own son Zeus, also by the help of his mother, Rheia; but no son had been able to dethrone him, for he had taken the precaution of making Kratos and Bia his guards:

ἀλλ' αἰεὶ πὰρ Ζηνὶ βαρυκτύπῳ ἑδριόωνται.

Theogon. 388.

It is all as plausible and as incoherent as most folklore and legendary theology. As many questions are left unanswered as answered. Was Chaos from eternity? Perchance it was too early for the human mind to have a conception of eternity; but was there anything before Chaos? If there were, what was it? If not, whence came Chaos? Did Chaos have part in the creaton of Gaia? If it did, how could chaotic disorder evolve order out of itself? If it did not, what were the forces that created her? Was there a power, unseen and unnamed, above them all, determining their rise, and at its will casting them down again? Hesiod more nearly approaches an answer to the last question, though perchance it is not consciously

given. It may be no more than an instinctive escape from the thought that any of these deities, even Zeus, can be the supreme rulers of the universe. They are subordinate to something else, but it is something too uncertain and too unintelligible to name; it can only be indicated by an impersonal verb:

καί οἱ πεφραδέτην, ὅσαπερ πέπρωτο γενέσθαι . . .
ἐκ γὰρ τῆς εἵμαρτο περίφρονα τέκνα γενέσθαι.

Theogon. 475, 894.

What was the Force that issued the decree? Hesiod has no answer: his mind only feels that there must be something that can direct the courses of the gods.

In Aischylos the idea becomes more definite, though he is not consistent. In the *Prometheus Vinctus*, which clearly looks back to the theological system of Hesiod, it is a supreme, transcendent principle, which Zeus himself cannot escape.

ΠΡ. οὐ ταῦτα ταύτῃ Μοῖρά πω τελεσφόρος
κρᾶναι πέπρωται, μυρίαις δὲ πημοναῖς
δύαις τε καμφθεὶς, ὧδε δεσμὰ φυγγάνω.
τέχνη δ' Ἀνάγκης ἀσθενεστέρα μακρῷ.
ΧΟ. τίς οὖν Ἀνάγκης ἐστὶν οἰακοστρόφος;
ΠΡ. Μοῖραι τρίμορφοι μνήμονές τ' Ἐρινύες.
ΧΟ. τούτων ἄρα Ζεύς ἐστιν ἀσθενέστερος;
ΠΡ. οὔκουν ἂν ἐκφύγοι γε τὴν πεπρωμένην.
ΧΟ. τί γὰρ πέπρωται Ζηνὶ, πλὴν ἀεὶ κρατεῖν;
ΠΡ. τοῦτ' οὐκέτ' ἂν πύθοιο, μηδὲ λιπάρει.

Prom. V. 511-20.

That was a line of enquiry that was not to be pursued too far.

The Greek mind was constantly feeling after its resting-place in a single, supreme deity, eternal, omnipotent, without peer or equal. It now and again caught glimpses of the conception, and tried to endow it with life and expression; but again and again it failed before its own aspirations, and was defeated by its own inheritance.

Hesiod follows the Homeric tradition in recognizing

that the gods make excursions amongst mortal men (*Od.* xvii, 485, ff).

> καί τε θεοὶ ξείνοισιν ἐοικότες ἀλλοδαποῖσιν,
> παντοῖοι τελέθοντες, ἐπιστρωφῶσι πόληας,
> ἀνθρώπων ὕβριν τε καὶ εὐνομίην ἐφορῶντες.

Hesiod says almost the same thing :

> . . . . ἐγγὺς γὰρ ἐν ἀνθρώποισιν ἐόντες
> ἀθάνατοι φράζονται ὅσοι σκολιῇσι δίκῃσι
> ἀλλήλους τρίβουσι θεῶν ὄπιν οὐκ ἀλέγοντες.
>
> O. D. 247-9.

Thereupon he departs from his predecessor. The gods were both near to men and too august for such proximity. The Oriental conception of majesty has crept in : royalty must not come into direct contact with ordinary men ; it is too sacred for such intercourse ; it must act upon the lower world and touch its affairs only through the mediation of agents. In the religion of the Jew the conception led to the creation of the angelic hosts of cherubim and seraphim around the throne of Jahveh, who do his service in the world of men. It produced the same results in the religion of the Greek, and Hesiod marks their inception :

> τρὶς γὰρ μύριοί εἰσιν ἐπὶ χθονὶ πουλυβοτείρῃ
> ἀθάνατοι Ζηνὸς φύλακες θνητῶν ἀνθρώπων ·
> οἵ ῥα φυλάσσουσίν τε δίκας καὶ σχέτλια ἔργα,
> ἠέρα ἑσσάμενοι πάντῃ φοιτῶντες ἐπ' αἶαν.
> ἡ δέ τε παρθένος ἐστὶ Δίκη, Διὸς ἐκγεγαυῖα,
> κυδνή τ' αἰδοίη τε θεοῖς οἳ Ὄλυμπον ἔχουσιν ·
> καί ῥ' ὁπόταν τίς μιν βλάπτῃ σκολιῶς ὀνοτάζων,
> αὐτίκα πὰρ Διὶ πατρὶ καθεζομένη Κρονίωνι
> γηρύετ' ἀνθρώπων ἄδικον νόον, ὄφρ' ἀποτίσῃ
> δῆμος ἀτασθαλίας βασιλέων, οἳ λυγρὰ νοεῦντες
> ἄλλῃ παρκλίνωσι δίκας σκολιῶς ἐνέποντες.
>
> O. D. 250-60.

The same idea comes earlier in the poem, verses 120-25.

These daimons do not yet assume definite shape, but material is provided for subsequent speculators, like the

Stoics, to endue them with substance, so that they could be the living vehicles of communion between the mortals of this earth and God abiding in the solitary and remote glory of his majesty.

These intermediate beings are as the magistrates and police of Zeus, who is himself almost completely shorn of any moral attributes. He is not wicked : he is simply non-moral. Kratos and Bia are the ministers of his throne, but those attributes are not amongst those which we to-day regard as inseparable from divinity.

The Μοῖραι are the real moral forces of the world and guardians of right conduct.

> *καὶ Μοίρας καὶ Κῆρας ἐγείνατο νηλεοποίνους,*
> *Κλωθώ τε Λάχεσίν τε καὶ Ἄτροπον, αἵτε βροτοῖσι*
> *γεινομένοισι διδοῦσιν ἔχειν ἀγαθόν τε κακόν τε,*
> *αἵτ' ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε παραιβασίας ἐφέπουσαι*
> *οὐδέποτε λήγουσι θεαὶ δεινοῖο χόλοιο,*
> *πρίν γ' ἀπὸ τῷ δώωσι κακὴν ὅπιν, ὅστις ἁμάρτῃ.*
> *τίκτε δὲ καὶ Νέμεσιν, πῆμα θνητοῖσι βροτοῖσι,*
> *Νὺξ ὀλοή.* *Theogon.* 217-23.

Dike, who in Homer was no more than an abstract quality, has developed into a divine personality and shares the work of the Μοῖραι. It would seem to indicate that as minister of justice on earth she is largely the independent representative of Zeus, from whom she derives her authority, but who is passive in its exercise. He is merely informed officially of men's iniquities. The need for information being laid by Dike is not consistent with what is said about Zeus only a few lines further on :

> *πάντα ἰδὼν Διὸς ὀφθαλμὸς καὶ πάντα νοήσας.*
> O. D. 265.

The poet's view of life's morals is largely determined by his personal experiences of injustice at the hands of his brother Perses, who by litigation had wrested from him too large a portion of the paternal estate :

> *ἤδη μὲν γὰρ κλῆρον ἐδασσάμεθ', ἄλλα τε πολλὰ*
> *ἁρπάζων ἐφόρεις, μέγα κυδαίνων βασιλῆας*

δωροφάγους, οἳ τήνδε δίκην ἐθέλουσι δικάσσαι,
νήπιοι, οὐδὲ ἴσασιν ὅσῳ πλέον ἥμισυ παντός,
οὐδ' ὅσον ἐν μαλάχῃ τε καὶ ἀσφοδέλῳ μέγ' ὄνειαρ.
O. D. 37-41.

The Works and Days is an encomium on work such as might satisfy Carlyle :

ἔργον δ' οὐδὲν ὄνειδος, ἀεργίη δέ τ' ὄνειδος. 309.

and it might be called " The Farmer's Almanac," with the secondary title, " Or, Honest Counsel to a Wastrel Brother."

Insolence and wrongdoing do not go unpunished, not even in mighty kings (246-9). Does Perses imagine that he can escape ? The retribution falls not on the sinner alone, but also upon those who stand near him. Cities are involved in the penalties that are sent upon their leaders :

πολλάκι καὶ ξύμπασα πόλις κακοῦ ἀνδρὸς ἀπηύρα,
ὅστις ἀλιτραίνει καὶ ἀτάσθαλα μηχανάαται.
τοῖσιν δ' οὐρανόθεν μέγ' ἐπήγαγε πῆμα Κρονίων,
λιμὸν ὁμοῦ καὶ λοιμόν. ἀποφθινύθουσι δὲ λαοί.
οὐδὲ γυναῖκες τίκτουσιν. μινύθουσι δὲ οἶκοι,
Ζηνὸς φραδμοσύνῃσιν Ὀλυμπίου. ἄλλοτε δ' αὖτε
ἢ τῶνγε στρατὸν εὐρὺν ἀπώλεσεν ἢ ὅγε τεῖχος,
ἢ νέας ἐν πόντῳ Κρονίδης ἀποτίνυται αὐτῶν.
O. D. 238-45.

Perses should have regard to his wife and household. Ill-gotten gains do not prosper ; the enjoyment of them is short-lived ; the gods are too strong for the rogue at the last :

χρήματα δ' οὐχ ἁρπακτά· θεόσδοτα πολλὸν ἀμείνω.
εἰ γάρ τις καὶ χερσὶ βίῃ μέγαν ὄλβον ἕληται,
ἢ ὅγ' ἀπὸ γλώσσης λήισσεται, οἷά τε πολλὰ
γίγνεται, εὖτ' ἂν δὴ κέρδος νόον ἐξαπατήσῃ
ἀνθρώπων, αἰδὼ δέ τ' ἀναιδείη κατοπάζῃ·
ῥεῖα δέ μιν μαυροῦσι θεοί, μινύθουσι δὲ οἶκοι
ἀνέρι τῷ, παῦρον δέ τ' ἐπὶ χρόνον ὄλβος ὀπηδεῖ.
O. D. 318-24.

Perses will find out about the wealth he snatched at that the realization of the expectation is not equal to the expectation of the realization. Though retribution come slowly, it will catch up to the offender in the end and throw him by the heels :

> . . . . δίκη δ' ὑπὲρ ὕβριος ἴσχει
> ἐς τέλος ἐξελθοῦσα . . .
> τῷ δ' ἤτοι Ζεὺς αὐτὸς ἀγαίεται, ἐς δὲ τελευτὴν
> ἔργων ἀντ' ἀδίκων χαλεπὴν ἐπέθηκεν ἀμοιβήν.
>
> 215, 331-2.

Perses will yet envy his poorer brother whom he wronged in his arrogant greed : there are powers above the law courts, after all, for which honest men do well to be thankful, and of whom idle vagabonds should be afraid. Men should live by justice, for it is that which distinguishes them from the brute (274-8). But justice included the duty of a double retaliation of evil for evil :

> . . . . εἰ δέ σέ γ' ἄρχῃ
> ἤ τι ἔπος εἰπὼν ἀποθύμιον ἠὲ καὶ ἔρξας,
> δὶς τόσα τίνυσθαι μεμνημένος. 707-9.

The good and the just man will not only escape from an uncomfortable place of torment in this world, but he will also enter into a very comfortable heaven. Honesty is an excellent policy : it is a better investment than philandering round law courts and insinuating bribes into the hands of juries. The wise, upright man will have his eyes on the returns that come to him for his integrity.

Virtue was made into a kind of commerce, but long ages in the world's history had to elapse before any people liberated themselves from that view of it. " If ye hearken diligently unto my commandments . . . I will give you the rain . . . that thou mayest gather in thy corn and thy wine and thine oil, and I will send grass in thy fields that thou mayest be full " (*Deut.* xi, 13-15). As Bacon says : " Prosperity is the blessing of the Old Testament, but Adversity of the New." Hesiod has almost the same kind of promises to make as the Deuteronomist : the city of the good man shall be a city abounding in prosperity ; flowing, indeed, with milk and honey (223-35).

Zeus can discern the just individual as easily as the just city, when either is to be rewarded :

> . . . εἰ γάρ τίς κ' ἐθέλῃ τὰ δίκαι' ἀγορεύειν
> γιγνώσκων, τῷ μέν τ' ὄλβον διδοῖ εὐρύοπα Ζεύς.
>
> 278-9.

The lesson is applied directly to Perses.

The morals of Hesiod's code were not inspiring, but they had a certain driving power. They would operate when the recompense was manifest and tangible, but fail when it was obscure or spiritual. In prosperity they would help a man to maintain his reputation for honesty, but virtue would stand a poor chance with poverty as its companion.

It was an unfortunate code for the Greek : it intensified his natural mercenariness. The young Hellene, trained in the prudential maxims of Hesiod, developed into the typical Greek of history : the admiration and envy of men for his cleverness, and their scorn for his moral incapacity to make any noble or solid use of his gifts. He was a creature of inexhaustible fertility of resource, but without either self-command or modesty : capable of anything as an impostor, of nothing as a man and a citizen. There was no trusting his unstable character or his fleeting impulses. His kinsman Lucian, the satirist, and Chrysostom, the Christian preacher, together with the Christian Apostle, condemn him for the same faults as Juvenal condemns the *esuriens Græculus*.

Hesiod was true to his nation's spirit, and the nation was too loyal to his theory of profitable virtue and to his ideals of worldly comfort. As invariably happens, his easier maxims were followed, his harder ones only quoted. He confirmed it in its disposition, justified it in its tendencies. His genius, his place in the early stages of the nation's conscious history, and his popularity all conspired to make his proverbial morality effective. He wrought in the clay when it was plastic : later teachers, though superior to him in genius, had to work in the clay when it was set and hardened in the furnace of time.

Hesiod's view of the life that is to follow this does not differ from Homer's. Existence continues ; but life ends

here. Immortality and felicity had once been granted to the race of men, but that was in the blameless ages of the world, when life was like to that of the gods :

> ὥστε θεοὶ δ' ἔζωον ἀκηδέα θυμὸν ἔχοντες.
>
> O. D. 112.

and old age was unknown and death came like a sleep. The happy dead then became the ministering daimons upon earth :

> τοὶ μὲν δαίμονές εἰσι Διὸς μεγάλου διὰ βουλὰς
> ἐσθλοί, ἐπιχθόνιοι, φύλακες θνητῶν ἀνθρώπων·
> οἵ ῥα φυλάσσουσίν τε δίκας καὶ σχέτλια ἔργα,
> ἠέρα ἐσσάμενοι πάντῃ φοιτῶντες ἐπ' αἶαν,
> πλουτοδόται. O. D. 121-4.

They were of the Golden Age. The dead of the Silver Age become not δαίμονες, but μάκαρες : they are of the second order.

> τοὶ μὲν ἐπιχθόνιοι μάκαρες θνητοὶ καλέονται
> δεύτεροι, ἀλλ' ἔμπης τιμὴ καὶ τοῖσιν ὀπηδεῖ.
>
> O. D. 140-1.

To the savage race of the Bronze Age there were only habitations like unto those they prepared for themselves on earth, and there they were lost in a merited oblivion.

> βῆσαν ἐς εὐρώεντα δόμον κρυεροῦ Ἄϊδαο
> νώνυμνοι. O. D. 152.

Silence covers the fate of the men of the Iron Age, but apparently they, too, enter the realms of Hades : they were meet for it. In the *Theogony* a hideous monster guards the gates of Hades :

> Κέρβερον ὠμηστήν, Ἄϊδεω κύνα χαλκεόφωνον,
> πεντηκοντακάρηνον, ἀναιδέα τε κρατερόν τε.
>
> *Theogon.* 311-12.

He welcomes all that arrive, but suffers none to depart. Those whom death has driven into those murky regions would escape if they could. Nothing short of such a

ghastly creature, and the fate he threatens, could keep them in :

> . . . δεινὸς δὲ κύων προπάροιθε φυλάσσει,
> νηλειής, τέχνην δὲ κακὴν ἔχει· ἐς μὲν ἰόντας
> σαίνει ὁμῶς οὐρῇ τε καὶ οὔασιν ἀμφοτέροισιν,
> ἐξελθεῖν δ' οὐκ αὖτις ἐᾷ πάλιν, ἀλλὰ δοκεύων
> ἐσθίει ὅν κε λάβῃσι πυλέων ἔκτοσθεν ἰόντα.
>
> *Theogon.* 769-73.

The Islands of the Blessed are on the horizon of the poet's vision, beyond the deeps of Okeanos, but their rich harvests and emancipation from sorrow are for the favourites of the gods in the age of the heroes : ordinary mortals may not approach them ; their end is in black misery :

> τοῖς δὲ δίχ' ἀνθρώπων βίοτον καὶ ἤθε' ὀπάσσας
> Ζεὺς Κρονίδης κατένασσε πατὴρ ἐς πείρατα γαίης,
> τηλοῦ ἀπ' ἀθανάτων· τοῖσιν Κρόνος ἐμβασιλεύει.
> καὶ τοὶ μὲν ναίουσιν ἀκηδέα θυμὸν ἔχοντες
> ἐν μακάρων νήσοισι παρ' Ὠκεανὸν βαθυδίνην,
> ὄλβιοι ἥρωες, τοῖσιν μελιηδέα καρπὸν
> τρὶς ἔτεος θάλλοντα φέρει ζείδωρος ἄρουρα.
>
> O. D. 166-71.

There are glimmerings in this eschatology of the after-life being a recompense of retribution for the life lived on earth, but they are soon lost in hopelessness, both for the present and the future. The worthy generations of ancient days, when uprightness dwelt on the earth, pass into happiness ; later generations of a degenerated race were unworthy of this blessing, and therefore lost it. The age in which the poet lived could only be the object of despair. Corrupt, avaricious, oppressive, its deserved fate was to pass away into oblivion. There was justice with the gods, and although not consistently manifested in their government of the world it nevertheless asserted itself over men when they departed through the gates of death into the other realm.

The conception of the ruler of the universe dealing with each man according as his deeds were good or evil had not dawned upon the world of religion. Mankind was judged in the mass : the individual shared the

ultimate fate of his fellows, just as the citizens of a city suffered collectively for the evils wrought by their king. The incentive that the hopes of the future provide for righteous conduct was lost, and the man directed himself towards making the best of this present world by whatever means were at his hand. Morality suffered, deprived of its stimulus; religion suffered, deprived of a judge of men who was just and equal in all his ways. Religion, having her eyes blinded, set before herself as her object the attainment of things that were deemed choicest in this life. Limited to this world, she partook of this world's spirit.

A further demonstration of that is the mental attitude in which Hesiod considers a man should offer his sacrifices unto the gods. They are an easy means of acquiring his neighbour's farm. Ahab need not kill Naboth to gain his vineyard: he could burn the rich fat of thighs, and pour libations to the gods regularly at morning and evening. The currency of Olympus is the same as in the market-place. Sheep and oxen are always worth their price, but they may fetch more when driven to the altar than the fair. If your neighbour be punctual in making his payments to heaven, and you not, you will find that he is able to buy your farm over your head. The gods are powerful, especially in that direction; it is a discreet policy to keep them in good humour. Any man knows that it is a wise course towards one's neighbour: invite him to dinner, if he be a decent fellow and pay you back; particularly if his land adjoins yours. You will find that your ox is safer. The great thing is to get full measure out of your neighbours; whether they be at the other end of the village or in Olympus is all one. There are certain prudential rules to be observed; they are applicable equally, and are distinctly profitable. The whole passage (O.D. 334-49) is probably one of the sincerest confessions in all literature.

When religion is at a low ebb superstition is at the flood. Hesiod's farmer would seem to have magic for everything, and for every day of the month. Washing the hands was as potent as prayer; to cut one's nails under

certain conditions, or to hold a wine-flagon in a certain way, was not only to court disaster, but to provoke the wrath of the gods :

μηδέ ποτ' ἀενάων ποταμῶν καλλίρροον ὕδωρ
ποσσὶ περᾶν, πρίν γ' εὔξῃ ἰδὼν ἐς καλὰ ῥέεθρα,
χεῖρας νιψάμενος πολυηράτῳ ὕδατι λευκῷ.
ὃς ποταμὸν διαβῇ, κακότητι δὲ χεῖρας ἄνιπτος,
τῷ δὲ θεοὶ νεμεσῶσι καὶ ἄλγεα δῶκαν ὀπίσσω.
μηδ' ἀπὸ πεντόζοιο θεῶν ἐνὶ δαιτὶ θαλείῃ
αὖον ἀπὸ χλωροῦ τάμνειν αἴθωνι σιδήρῳ.
μηδέ ποτ' οἰνοχόην τιθέμεν κρητῆρος ὕπερθεν
πινόντων· ὀλοὴ γὰρ ἐπ' αὐτῷ μοῖρα τέτυκται.

O. D. 735-43.

The Homeric heroes had little superstition about them, and their religion, whatever its quantity, was of more robust quality.

The pessimism that comes across the Homeric poems like a cloud in May has spread till it covers the sky, and only occasional shafts of light penetrate it. The whole earth is full of misery :

ἄλλα δὲ μυρία λυγρὰ κατ' ἀνθρώπους ἀλάληται.
πλείη μὲν γὰρ γαῖα κακῶν, πλείη δὲ θάλασσα·
νοῦσοι δ' ἀνθρώποισιν ἐφ' ἡμέρῃ ἠδ' ἐπὶ νυκτὶ
αὐτόματοι φοιτῶσι κακὰ θνητοῖσι φέρουσαι.

O. D. 100-3.

Man, too, is given over to wickedness. The hawks are mightier than the doves, and get their way in this life (O.D. 201-9) ; it is not much use to appeal to them : the higher their station the more arrogant their speech and the stronger their claws.

Hesiod traces this condition of things to the gift of Pandora from Zeus, and the act of Afterthought, the foolish brother of Prometheus, Forethought. The real cause is deeper than the myth, though it illustrates it. Man had no deliverance to expect from the gods, and could accomplish none for himself. His best forethought, seeking a way of salvation, brought the greater sorrow in the wake of its attempts. Man's blindness and ignor-

ance made the best intentioned and bravest efforts on his behalf abortive. The gods were against him: the heavens were as brass over his head. He was judged and punished for his failures and transgressions, but those that judged him led him into sin, and those that punished him instigated the offence. Zeus allowed Prometheus to outwit him; it is part of the wrathful scheme to the end that man shall suffer even in his gain; and the father of gods and men laughs aloud at the cleverness and the anticipated success of his wily device. More ghastly laughter was never heard in the ears of men:

> . . . ἐκ δ' ἐγέλασσε πατὴρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε.
>
> O. D. 59.

It is worse than the laughter of the gods over Ares and Aphrodite.

The present world was moral chaos, to which the very guardians of moral conduct were parties. Misery was the common lot, for which there was no remedy. The future offered no hope. The good and evil suffered the same fate beyond the gates of death. The melancholy of despair was settling heavily upon the life of man; soon the cry will become more acute; it will be like a wail:

> οὐδὲ μάκαρ οὐδεὶς πέλεται βροτός· ἀλλὰ πόνηροι
> πάντες, ὅσους θνητοὺς ἠέλιος καθορᾷ.
>
> *Solon* vi.

Life is a burden; better were it for a man not to have to carry it, or the sooner he is rid of it the better; death, gloomy and wretched as it is, could not be worse than life; better see the gates of Hades, where savage Kerberos sits with his fifty brazen-throated heads, than the light of the sun. So said Theognis (425 ff.), and others were saying the same kind of thing. The world to-day does not know what a pessimist is.

These writers, not far removed from Hesiod in time, are but stating with greater definiteness the logic of his facts. He is the father of pessimism, and many generations bore his likeness. The music of the lyrical ode, celebrating victory, subdues its loud melodies, that the

wail over the afflictions of life and the harshness of the gods may be heard.

Greek tragedy, like all tragedy, of necessity is clad in austere mourning. There is a sorrow that is unto death, and a sorrow that is not unto death : hers is not the latter. Her eyes are moist with tears for the fate of men : she has a broken heart that none can heal. The most pathetic tragedy ever placed on the English stage—*King Lear*—has the healing grace of a woman's love and a man's fidelity. Even Lear's world is not a world forlorn. Greek tragedy moves in pervading gloom. Neither the religious Aischylos and Sophokles, nor Euripides the religious freethinker, can extricate themselves from it. The Prometheus, the Oidipous, the Hekabe, the Mad Herakles are tragedies of despair. Humanity is no match for the hostile gods : it has its Calvary, but there is no resurrection morning ; its crucifixion, but there is no broken tomb. The dirge of life was first set to the music of poetry by Hesiod.

The experience of Hesiod is as eloquent as his poetry concerning the religious life of his times. He was conscious of a divine call to his work, and of a divine inspiration to fulfil it. While he pastured his father's flock upon Mount Helikon the Muses appeared to him and appointed him to be the poet of didactic song, as Homer had been of the epic, and he was to teach men the story of the immortal gods. Thereupon they invested him with a wand of blossoming bay, and endowed him with divine powers of speech (*Theog.* 22-34).

It is not easy for ordinary people to determine the exact nature of a poet's experiences. Is he recounting what was to him at the time a reality, or is he merely describing in poetical language, and with a poet's licence, a resolve which cannot be differentiated in its inception from the decision of an ordinary man made under ordinary circumstances ?

To Hesiod his call was undoubtedly the intensest of realities. The change from the shepherd's crook to the poet's pen is both great and startling : something of an impressive character must have happened to start him

upon such an enterprise. The eared tripod, dedicated by him in after years to the Muses of Helikon, is a proof that both the place and its deities, though unseen by ordinary eyes, had the greatest significance to him in his poetic career.

> τὸν μὲν ἐγὼ Μούσῃσ' Ἑλικωνιάδεσσ' ἀνέθηκα,
> ἔνθα με τὸ πρῶτον λιγυρῆς ἐπέβησαν ἀοιδῆς . . .
> Μοῦσαι γάρ μ' ἔδίδαξαν ἀθέσφατον ὕμνον ἀείδειν.
>
> O. D. 656, 657, 660.

His call is almost parallel with the call of the Hebrew prophet Isaiah (Chap. vi.). One can be understood by the other. What the vision in the temple was to the one the vision in the fields of Helikon was to the other. Each sees according to his own forms of thought: the one muses, the other seraphim; the one has placed in his hand the insignia of the poet, the other has his lips purified with an altar coal; each knows himself to be designated from that moment to a vocation beyond that of the common man. He is thenceforth the man with an inspiration. Each holds firmly to the belief that at life's great moments man and god touch each other. Without either smoking altar or robed priest god holds intimate communion with his creature and reveals to him his will.

The inspiration of each is limited by his own capacities. He can receive it only in that measure and capacity which accords with his own soul. Here the cleavage between the two men becomes manifest. The one can receive much, the other little; the one can make known the holiness of heaven and the laws of righteousness for man; the other knows only the strife of heaven, and gives unto men maxims of morality based on self-interest. Isaiah had predecessors, Hesiod had none: he was the first to embark upon that journey of faith. The predecessors of Isaiah were not his peers in spiritual vision. Samuel was not the first of the long line, but part of his functions in the mind of the people, and probably in his own, was to use his supernatural powers in tracing lost animals for a fee. The story shows he had given cause for the current report. His Jahveh was a fierce god, who could take de-

light in seeing king Agag hewn in pieces before his face by the hand of his prophet.

Both Samuel and Hesiod are to be esteemed for the moral advance in which they lead, and not condemned for failing to equal their successors. Yet great is the difference between the first Hellene to be conscious of the divine afflatus and the first Jew. In both cases the atmosphere of the higher life, before it became the breath of man, had passed over marsh and fen and had been contaminated by them ; but the one had absorbed a larger measure of the noxious gases. The Hebrew was moved to lift up his eyes towards the infinite, and he taught a host of his successors to look thither. The successors of the Greek were few, and their vision was but to the tops of the lower hills.

The one was germinal of a new life, which finally pervades the civilized world ; the other was not, and in spite of the beautiful genius of some of the great minds of Greece none came to her who were able to receive those qualities of inspiration that made the Hebrew Scriptures the religious inheritance of all mankind.

Chapter XV. The Failure of the Theologian

THE Olympian religion and its poets accomplished much, but failure was their companion attending close upon their success. The cruelties, the obscenities, the base beliefs, that were banished from religion so far as its literature was concerned, lingered in the darker parts of the country ; they formed the secret, or even the open, practices of the people, and were their stories round their fires at night. Homer can ignore the ugly legends ; Hesiod, though some generations have passed, shows that those legends are still current, and too inveterate to be ignored. Though they belonged to the field and the village the people of the town liked to read them.

The transition from the worship of natural forces to deified beings who wield those forces is no small gain ; but the loss was considerable when the deity is supposed to hold immediate control over those forces and to send them on their mission. The tempest and the lightning, destroying good and evil alike, become the agents of a moral being, and moral reasons have to be provided for his actions. They are never adequate : the god is made a being of caprice.

There is moral gain in banishing from before the eyes of the people and out of their ceremonies the homage paid to sexual emblems of fertility; but when the qualities symbolized are transferred to the supreme deities, deity itself is corroded as with acids, which finally destroy it.

The conception of a supreme order of beings who order the affairs of this world was moral advance, but it failed to create an intellectual order, either on earth or in heaven. The only security is in monotheism. Of that there were early and flashing glimpses ; in later centuries there were brilliant dreams of hope ; but all vanished in the mists. The members of the Pantheon were too substantial to be dethroned. Their creation had been too complete : the very forces that had established them had rendered them invincible.

Hellas had great men, even the greatest of every order, but she had no prophet, and that was her irreparable loss,

for he is verily the maker of empire as well as of men. A nation is something more than what is represented by pink patches upon a map : it is men, it is mind, it is soul. The hand of the prophet is active along the frontier lines of empire because it is active at its centre : he is the human channel of those forces whose operations endure.

Who is this man, this prophet ? No stress is laid upon the reputed capacity which was once regarded as his supreme attribute—the capacity to foretell the future. Wizardry does not make him ; inspiration does. He is the man with a message brought from holy places ; he has had visions of the invisible ; his eye is lit with the knowledge of eternal principles ; he is the conscience that is awake and sensitive when the conscience of the rest of men is drugged with sleep or seared into insensitiveness ; he is one of the human links to bind this earth to the throne of God ; he is the lightning from heaven, for whom the rest of men wait like fuel for the kindling, and then they, too, flame.

The two nations in whom we can see the value of this man are the Greek and the Jew : in the one by his absence, in the other by his presence. He it was who made the one ; the other became what it did because it had him not. These two nations stand out in the history of the world. Each felt itself to be a peculiar people, separated from the rest of mankind ; each traced its origin to famous men whose deeds were invested with undying significance ; each was conscious that it had a destiny that needed the whole world for its accomplishment ; and each worked out that destiny according to the principles enshrined in its life.

The ideal of the Greek was the attainment of the fullest culture, in all its aspects, of the merely human life ; and he worked it out in the arts and sciences. He gave the world architecture, sculpture, painting, philosophy, the music of words, perhaps of melody too, and the science of government. Nearly all he touched he raised to the highest perfection attained, or perhaps attainable, by the human mind.

The Jew had no art except music ; no science, no

philosophy, no organized political life, no civic activities ; in sculpture he was an iconoclast ; he erected no building to be a model for all time. His possession was a poetry of a unique order, not of the epic, nor of the drama ; nor was there any laughter in it, but the communings of the soul face to face with its God, pervaded by a sublimity with which there is no parallel.

The Greek poet, looking upon his fellows and expressing the very soul of his race, said : " Wonders are many, but nothing is more wonderful than man " : a word we could agree with if we forgot some things, and those the highest. The Jew had his face to the heavens, where " The Lord sitteth above the water-floods, and the clouds and darkness are round about him ; righteousness and judgement are the habitations of his seat " ; and he, too, uttered the very soul of his race when he said : " What is man, that Thou art mindful of him? and the son of man, that Thou visitest him ? "

His calling was a spiritual one, and his history through affliction and suffering was its preparation. The outward trappings of national existence fell away. Wars, politics, even heroic struggles occupy less and less space in his annals. While Thukydides, by the power of his pen, is exalting the skirmishes of a handful of men into a world drama, Judah is suffering from the convulsions that marked the expiring Persian empire ; but of that suffering there is hardly a recorded word. They were content to suffer; it was not worth an historian's pen. The thing that mattered was the prerogative of their race: to hold with untrembling hand, amidst the tottering of empires, the ensign of the Lord of Hosts, and to say to the peoples : " Behold your God ! " The one nation was fashioned almost exclusively by the hand of the prophet; the other never knew its touch.

Yet had the Greek no prophet ? Is not our very word Greek, and not Hebrew ? Apollo is the προφήτης of Zeus, who in his turn had his προφῆται mouthing in frenzy their ambiguous oracles : selfish, ambitious, and, at one crisis at least of their country's history, selling themselves to the common enemy. How vast the difference ! Cassan-

dra and Moses; a raving Pythoness, obsessed with delirium, and Isaiah living in the serene height of the Most High and with illuminated soul declaring the laws of righteousness. We have taken the word from one language, but its meaning from the other.

In moral equipment at the early stages of history the advantage was all with the Greek. In the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* we have a description of the Greeks just as they are stepping with the strength of youth into the light of history. An inimitable hand has made them live before us and speak into our ear, so that to-morrow, were we to meet them, we should recognize the angry Achilleus, the crafty Odysseus, the youthful Patroklos; and the insolent, garrulous Thersites, meet only to be smote upon the head, is recognizable in some councils.

The analysis of their moral code shows that if it could not be called high by modern standards—though many in civilized lands to-day are living less worthily—it was high in comparison with all ancient standards, including that of Israel in its early periods.

Life is pure. The subject of the *Iliad*, the crime of Paris and the abduction of Helen, gave abundant occasion for indelicacy, but it is so handled that none can be offended. The story of the *Odyssey* is the insolent advances of the suitors to Penelope, but it is to show a woman's unsullied beauty of character and invincible fidelity. There is no Penelope in the Old Testament; there is no Jezebel in Homer.

Marriage is honoured and honourable. No man treats his wife as Abraham is recorded to have treated Sarah, and Isaac Rebekah. Sexual frailty is rare; divorce is unknown. There is no trace of the professional corruption of woman which invaded the tabernacle in the wilderness and is the shame of our modern life. There is no monstrous sensuality like that ascribed to David; no lust like that ascribed to his family. Unnatural vices do not obtrude their horrid shape.

Family life is sweet and affectionate. The mother of Odysseus pines and dies of a broken heart over the long absence of her son; his aged father faints at the fiction

of his death. Infancy is loved ; there is no smoking altar of Moloch for the immolation of children. There is no more charming picture of a family circle anywhere than the meeting of Hektor, Andromache, and their little son.

When men go to war they are fierce, for war, born of the evil passions of men, will ever bear trace of its parentage ; but there is no cruel butchery, no indiscriminate extirpation, in which soldier and citizen, man, woman, and child are piled in one bloodstained heap.

Men drink the wine, but they are not drunken ; and they offer their cup and their table to the stranger and the mendicant. A Greek Jael would have brought forth milk, and have offered it in a lordly dish, but she would not have gone softly with a nail of the tent and a hammer ; or, if she had, no one would have called her " Blessed among women of the tent."

Men are honest, in the main, in both word and deed. They hate lies. Odysseus is the schemer ; but he is not a Jacob, tricking father and brother. They have horse-races, and a man's word is taken that he was not cheating. No one would accept a jockey's word to-day.

It is impossible to amplify a comparison that would need a volume to complete; it can be summed up in this: the moral judgements of Homer are right and just—it is not every Christian writer even who succeeds in carrying the reader's instinct of approval and disapproval to their proper objects with such unfailing rectitude ; and in this : there are only two passages, one of a hundred lines and the other of a line and a half, out of the 28,000 or so which a child might not safely read. One would hesitate to affirm that of the historical books of the Old Testament. Those two passages belong to the gods rather than to men. One is the story of their amours, and the other is the base counsel given by Thetis to her son Achilleus, which the man, the moral superior, silently ignores.

It would have been preferable to live in the moral atmosphere of sea-girt Ithaka, where Odysseus had his home, or in any of the towns of the soldiers who fought their long war round the walls of Troy, than just across the blue Mediterranean in the times of the Judges, which

could not have been far removed from being contemporaneous, where every man did that which was right in his own eyes.

Eight or ten centuries before the Christian era the Greek had the advantage in moral equipment over the Jew. The rest of the story can only be indicated. In his golden age he worked out all his ideals, rose to the summit of intellectual greatness, and then sank to the slough of moral pollution. His gods could send him no vision of holiness ; his teachers gave him but little warning of impending retribution for outraged law. In the day of his splendour one of the most splendid intellects of his race was using its endowments to display upon the stage the vilest exhibition of obscenity ever put before the eyes of his fellow citizens, who laughed and applauded the vices that were their own. Homer was his age ; so was Aristophanes.

But there was a lower degradation than that. The Greek, having lost that which was his pride, the empire of the mind, sunk to where shame feels no shame, and the descendant of the hero of Marathon became the little starveling Greek of Juvenal's scorn. The satirist, though too tolerant of vice, said that he could endure anything but a Greekized Rome. It was from this man that St. Paul saw such grave dangers for the Christian Church : the idle, gossiping Athenian ; the sensual Corinthian, in intellect a man, in moral seriousness a babe ; the servile and superstitious Ephesian, " carried away by every blast of vain teaching " ; the false and avaricious Cretans, " Ever liars, evil beasts " ; the impulsive, unstable Galatian, " senseless and bewitched " ; the Greek Christian at Rome, whom he sternly warns against thinking of himself " more highly than he ought to think."

How terribly Greece fell, the tragedy of the nations ! After her buildings had been demolished by her enemies there yet remained fragments to indicate their original magnificence ; after time and the ignorance of men had destroyed much of her literature the world was left in possession of portions that shine like morning stars in the heavens of the mind ; after the choicest of her marbles

had been shattered by the enemies of mankind the explorer unearthed mutilated sculptures whose transcendent beauty even mutilation could not utterly destroy; but when Greece fell she left not a fragment of her national life to win the admiration or to stir the envy of the beholder. From that day to this who would wish to be a Greek? She had all gifts and all men, except a prophet to speak to her a living word, therefore neither their profusion nor their supremacy could preserve her from being consumed by her unrebuked sins. As Athens fell, so Greece as a whole fell. When the sacred trireme, having escaped from the wreckage of Ægospotami, brought the news on that dark September night, made sleepless with terror and dismay, and the lamentation passed from mouth to mouth along the walls of the Piræus to the Akropolis that the fleet—their hope, their exultation, and their strength—was destroyed, the poignant anguish of that hour of ruin and defeat was made more poignant still, as one of her own sons informs us,* by the avenging memories of her own wrongdoing, which bade her know that she was to drink the cup she had filled for others with tyrannies and arrogance. Then did her enemies, to the sound of the flute, raze her defences to the ground, deeming that hour to be the dawn of the liberty of Greece. What was true of the city was true of the nation: she had to drink the cup of her iniquities, filled to the full by her own hand. Then did the world that beheld her ruin deem it was even better so: that men should learn that eloquence uninspired by conscience, art shorn of morality, genius unadorned by righteousness, and beauty bereaved of her white-robed sister purity ended in the corruption of the grave.

During those centuries what is happening to the people of that insignificant strip of hill and valley on the east of the Mediterranean? Conscious of their spiritual calling, they are proclaiming their spiritual message. The land may be conquered, and foreign governors hold dominion over it, yet there remained a remnant that was unsubduable by any human power. "The nations shall be chased as chaff of the mountains before the wind, and like

* Xen., *Hist.* ii, 2.

a rolling thing before the whirlwind ; behold, at the eventide trouble, and before the morning he is not." Is it populous Nineveh, situated amidst the rivers of water ?—" All that look upon thee shall flee from thee, and say, Nineveh is laid waste ; who will bemoan her ? " Is it Damascus, whose antiquity was before the days of Abraham?—"Damascus is waxed feeble,and turneth herself to flee, and fear hath seized on her, anguish and sorrow have taken her, as a woman in travail." Is it the Phœnecian wealth of Tyre?—"Howl,ye ships of Tarshish, for Tyre is laid waste. . . . Is this your joyous city, whose antiquity is of ancient days ? " Is it the splendid and immemorial regnancy of Egypt?—" The sceptre of Egypt shall pass away." Is it Babylon the mighty, rich in treasures that would mount up to heaven?—The dead move at her coming to ask of her king in derision, " Art thou become weak as we ? Art thou become like unto us ? " So with all the nations, but Judah abides. Led by men in whom was a light brighter than of this world, she left the miasmal gloom where her moral life was indistinguishable from that of the rest of the Shemitic nations and is ascending the heaven-lit, moral altitudes. Ever attaining new heights, she is flashing new truths more widely across the darkness, till from her hills, when Greece the beautiful, the illustrious, the pride of the world, has become a foul stain, and a pollution even to the wicked, there shines a light like a sun across the earth. Sinning ? Yes, even grievously, and had suffered affliction by her sins as the rest of the nations suffered, yet holding to the message of the life of the spirit that had been delivered to her by her prophets. Repenting ? Yes, with groanings and with tears as no other nation ever repented, because amidst disaster and retribution she was still cleaving in faith to the word delivered to her.

To-day, while the civilized world is repeating the Decalogue of the Jew, breathing the hopes of his prophets and endeavouring to build the world of which he dreamed, few but the student know the words of Homer, who gave being to the gods of Olympus ; or of Hesiod, who gave them a theology.